A VINDICATION OF THE DISSERTATIONS CONCERNING EPISCOPACIE

From the ANSWERS, or EXCEPTIONS offered against them by the London Ministers in their *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici.*

By H. HAMMOND, D.D.

LONDON,
Printed by J. G. for Richard Royston, at the Angel
in Ivy-lane. 1654.

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

DISSERTATIONS

CONCERNING

EPISCOPACY:

From the Answers, or Exceptions offered against

By H. Hammond, D.D.

LONDON,

Printed by J. G. for Richard Royston, at the Angel

in Ivy-lane, 1654.

TO THE READER.

IN *Eraſmus*'s *diſtribution* of his owne writings into *Tomes*, the 8th. we finde thus inſcribed by him, *Octavum occupent Apologiæ. Me miſerum. Et hæ juſtum volumen efficient.* It was his great *infelicity*, that the *Apologies* and *Anſwers* to *exceptions* and *calumnies*, which he was conſtreined to *write*, made up an *intire* large *Volume in folio*. Now though I have that pleaſure in the *temper* of that perſon, which gives me *ſecurity*, by the *Romaniſts Proverbe*, never to be deemed one of their good *Catholicks*, and ſo may probably *partake* of ſome *part* of his *fate*, yet 't were great inſolence in me, who have not troubled the World with a *tenth* proportion to that werewith he hath *favoured* it, to expect the *Tithe* of that *conſideration*, which is required to make one capable of that *degree* of *infelicity*, which lay a full load on him; Nevertheleſſe theſe few laſt moneths have given me a taſt and δείξις what I am to expect. For beſides the *reproaches* of one *learned Gentleman* (to which, being barely ſuch, I have no one word to retribute, but that of the εὐλογία which *Chriſt* directs me to) I have farther met with ſome *variety*; Many *exceptions*, though litle of *contumely* from theſe *Aſſemblies*; More, and in a very diſtant

Character from a large *Preface* of *Animadverſions* on the *Diſſertations* ſent me lately from *Oxford*; others alſo there are which I have not yet had leaſure to weigh, but ſoon purpoſe and hope to do it; and if either I diſcerne my ſelfe, or finde it the opinion of others, that what is already ſaid in the Tracts, which they oppoſe, be not ſufficient to *prevent*, or *remove* the *ſcruples* propoſed by them, I ſhall willingly *dedicate* ſome time of *vacancy* to that imployment. At the preſent, the *Exceptions* of the *London Miniſters* have challenged the *precedence*, and here are offered to *conſideration*. And becauſe the *Præface* from *Oxford* falls on the ſame ſort of matter, *Epiſcopacy* and *Ignatius's Epiſtles*, as they are defended in the *Diſſertations*, I purpoſe, *God willing*, that an *Anſwer* to that ſhall now follow, aſſoone as the *Printer* can diſpatch it. And that is all that I had to ſay to the *Reader* by way of *Præface*.

THE

THE TABLE.

CHAP. I.

CConcerning the Angels of the Churches of Asia, Page 9.

Section 1.

The grounds of affirming them to be Bishops. Ibid.

Sect. 2. *Of* Timothy, *of* Onesimus, *of* Policarpe, p. 15.

Sect. 3. *Of the negative argument from S.* John's *not using the word* Bishop. *Of* Πρεσβυτερος *in the Revelation,* p. 19

Sect. 4. *Of S.* Johns *writings. Againe of* Diotrephes, p. 25

Sect. 5. *Of S.* John's *being* Bishop *of* Asia. *Of the Apostles being* Bishops, p. 29

Sect. 6. *Of the word Angel, and Star, pretended to be common to all Ministers. Of Messenger, and Embassadour. The singularity of the word Angel,* p. 35

Sect. 7. *Of their exception to our arguing from Symbols: Of Bishop and Elder being the same,* p. 38

Sect. 8. *Of the singularity of each Angel. The objections from the use of the plurall number,* p. 41

Sect. 9. *Of the Elders at* Ephesus *Act.* 20. p. 45

Sect. 10. *Of expressing a number by singulars. A Church by a Candlestick. Of the seven Angels* Rev. 8. p. 47

Sect. 11. *Of the Epistles being sent to the whole Church, not to the* Bishop *only. Of* Timothy, Onesimus *and* Polycarp, *being* Bishops *of some of the* Asian *Churches, without any charge of Apostacy falling on them by this meanes,* p. 50

Sect. 12. *Of* Timothies *being an Evangelist, that it hinders not his being a* Bishop. p. 55

Sect. 13. *Of the* Bishops *at* Ephesus. *Of the plural number in the Epistle to the Angel of* Smyrna, p. 56

Sect. 14. *Of* Beza's *interpretation, of the President,* p. 57.

Sect. 15. *Of Dr.* Reynolds *interpretation, of the* Bishop *in* Cyprian. *Of Ordination by* Bishops *not without* Presbyters, *from the Testimones of* Cyprian, *and* Fermilian, p. 51
Sect. 16. *Of the Churches of* Asia *being Metropoliticall. Of the paucity of believers,* p. 54
Sect. 16. *Of modelling Churches according to the Government of the* Roman *state. Of exemplars of Metropolitans among the* Jewes. *Testimonies of the Apostles instituting Metropolitans,* p. 67
Sect. 17. *Of the objection against Metropoles from the seven* Starres *in seven Churches,* p. 71
Sect. 18. *Of the use of the word Bishop for Archbishop in* Tertullian: *Of Angel in Christs Epistle.* p. 64
Sect. 19. *Of division into Parishes, and Union into Dioceses. Of Diocesan Bishops in the Apostles dayes. Elders in every Church,* Act. 14. *Elders of the Church,* Act. 20. *That place vindicated from exception.* p. 75

Chap. II.

Of the equivalence of the words Bishop and Elder in the New Testament. p. 92
Sect. 1. *Foure sorts of equivalence of these words proposed,* Ibid.
Sect. 2. *Of the word* Ἐπίσκοπος, p. 95
Sect. 3. *Of the word* Πρεσβύτερος *Elder,* p. 100
Sect. 4. *Of reverence to Antiquity, and the interpretations of the Antients. Of Prælatists disagreement among themselves,* 102.
Sect. 5. *Inconveniencies objected, and answer'd. Of more Bishops in one City. No Presbyters in the Apostles dayes. The no Divine right of the order of* Presbyters, p. 105
Sect 6. *A first confession objected and vindicated. Of the Ephesine* Presbyters *being all the Prælates of* Asia, *Elders, Aldermanni,* p. 108
Sect. 7. *A second confession of the* Bishops, *Phil.* 1. 1. *being* Bishops *of that whole Province, Philippi a Metropolis, and a Colony,* p. 110
Sect. 8. *A third confession, of* Timothies *being an Archbishop.*

Of the qualifications, 1 Tim. 3. 2 *belonging to* Bishops. *Of the* Bishops *being worthy of double honour, though he never preach.* Of the word, and Doctrine. Of the Presbytory, 1 Tim. 4. *Of Rebuking and receiving accusation against an Elder.* p. 112

Sect. 9. *A fourth confession of* Titus *being Archbishop of* Creet, p. 116

Sect. 10. *A fift change of contrariety to Scripture answered. Of visitation of the sick belonging to Elders,* James 5. p. 118

Sect. 11. *A last objection from* Act. 21. 18. *and* 24. 3. *and* 11. 30. *answered. Elders for Rulers in Bishops.* p. 122

Chap. III.

Concerning the Opinion of Antiquity in this Question. Page 129.

Sect. 1. *The Testimonies of* Clemens Romanus, *Bishops and Deacons the onely offices at the first.* Corinth *Metropolis of* Achaia. *What* χωρὶς *signifies. The Apostles care to prevent contentions about Episcopacy.* Hegesippus's *testimony of the contentions at* Corinth. Clement *a Bishop,* p. 129.

Sect. 2. *The Testimony of* Policarpe. *That he was himselfe a Bishop. His mention of* Ignatius's *Epistles, fit to give authority to them, being so confirmed as it is by a series of the Antients,* p. 139

Sect. 3. *A vindication of* Ignatius's *Epistles,* Vossius's *edition of them, and the* Archbishops *of* Armagh. *Some Testimonies out of them, The cause of his so inculcating obedience to* Bishops. *Mr.* Causabones *Testimony considered, and the Allegations from the* Archbishop *of* Armagh. *Three reasons against these Epistles answered* (*No Marriage without the* Bishop.) *Of the Reformed Churches. Of the Church of* Scotland *after the first conversion,* p. 143

Sect. 4. *Of* Salmasius's *conceit that these Epistles were written at the time of Episcopacy first entring the Church,* p. 163

Sect. 5. *Testimonies of* Iræneus, *The use of* Presbyteri *for* Bishops, p. 165

Sect.

Sect. 5. *Testimonies of* Tertullian. Seniores & Majores natu *for* Bishops, *so in* Firmilian. p. 169
Sect. 6. S. Jerom's *Testimony of* Bishops, *&c. by a Apostolicall Tradition.* Consuetudo *opposed to* Dominica dispositio. S. Jerom's *meaning evidenced by many other Testimonies to be, that Bishops were instituted by the Apostles. So by* Panormitan *also. The Testimonies of* Isidore, *&c. the Councell of* Aquen, *and of* Leo *vindicated. Of* Ischyras's *Ordination. The testimony of the Synod* ad Zurrium, *and of the* 4th *Councell of* Carthage. p. 171
Sect. 7. *The Testimonies of* Ambrose *and* Austin. Consignare *used for consecrating the* Eucharist, *and that belonged to the* Bishop *when present.* p. 187
Sect. 8. *Of the Chorepiscopi.* p. 189

A VINDICATION OF THE Dissertations concerning *Episcopacy*,

From the Answers or Exceptions offered against them by the *London-Ministers* in their *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici.*

The INTRODUCTION.

Of the occasion of this Worke, The state of the Controversie, The Heads of the Prelatists Plea, from Scripture and Antiquity, with some Observations assistant to them. The considerable concernements of the question.

BEing advertised from many hands, that the Booke called *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, which is lately published by some, who intitle themselves the *Provinciall Assembly* of *London*, hath undertaken to consider and confute many passages of the *Dissertations*, three years since published in *Latine*, in defence of *Episcopacy*, Num. 1.

againſt D. *Blondell* and others, I have thought my ſelfe obliged to examine whether there be any thing objected by them in relation to thoſe *Diſſertations*, which may reaſonably move me to *retract* what was there either with *diffidence* propoſed, or more *confidently* aſſerted by me.

2. And having diligently ſurveyed the whole *Booke*, that I might omit no paſſage, wherein my intereſts might be in the leaſt concern'd & being truly able to affirme from that view, that it hath yielded me no one ſyllable of uſefull *Exhortation*, no motive to *retract* any period, or alter any expreſſion in thoſe *Diſſertations* (but as farre, as I doe perſwade my ſelfe that this *Provinciall Synod* containes in it Men of *judgement* and *abilities* to maintaine the truth and *convince gaine-ſayers*, ſo farre I am forced to aſſume) that what I have written is teſtified to be *Truth*, and by that priviledge competently ſecured againſt all *oppoſers* I might herein reaſonably *acquieſce*, without farther importuning the Reader or my ſelfe with impertinent *vindications*, onely truſting and adventuring the whole matter to the judgement of each intelligent Reader, who is obliged by all Rules of *Juſtice* to compare either by his *Memory*, or by his *Eye* thoſe paſſages in this Booke, and the *Chapters* in the *Diſſertations* to which they are confronted.

3. But I am againe told that many, who have read and are moved by the *Arguments* and *Anſwers* of this Booke, and the *Authority* of a *Provinciall Synod*, are yet diſabled to be ſo juſt as to examine them by comparing them with the *latine Diſſertations*, and that we are fallen upon thoſe times wherein whatſoever is not anſwered, is cried up as unanſwerable (an humour, of which, if I might be permitted to receive the *fruits*, I ſhould have no temptation to complaine, there being ſo much a greater part of thoſe *Diſſertations*, which was never attempted to be *anſwered*,) I continue ſtill under ſome ſeeming obligation to give an exact account of the whole matter as it lies in conteſt betweene this *Provinciall Synod* and thoſe *Diſſertations*, and I ſhall haſten to doe it, when I have firſt by way of *neceſſary Introduction* premiſed theſe two things.

4. Firſt,

4. First, the *ſtate* of the *Controverſy*, as it generally lies between us, which is this; whether the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, when they planted *Churches* in each City, left them in the hands of *many* to be governed by the *Common Councell* of thoſe *many*, erecting an *equality* or *parity* of ſeverall *Rulers* in every City, to whom all others were ſubjected, and they to none: or whether they placed the *Superiour* power and *Authority* in ſome *one*, and ſubjected all others to him. Other conſequent differences there are ariſing from hence, (and thoſe of ſuch *weight* and *concernment* to thoſe with whom I now diſpute, in caſe the *Truth* be not on their ſides, as will make this *returne* to their *Objections*, no leſſe than a duty of *Charity*, as to *Brethren*, if by the *Grace* of *God* they ſhall judge it *reaſonable* to make that uſe of it) but this is the one *Baſis* of all, whether the *Apoſtles* planted *parity* or *imparity* in the *Church*, *many* equall *Governours* in one City, or but *one* in each. The former is the *Presbyterians* intereſt to defend, the latter the *Prelatiſts*; And ſo the controverſy ſtands between them to be debated and evinced by ſuch evidences as a matter of *Fact* is capable of, (the *Right* being by both ſides acknowledged to follow that *Fact*) *i. e.* by the *Teſtimonies* of thoſe who are fit to be credited in this matter.

Secondly, the *briefe heads* of the Plea, by which I have undertaken to maintaine the *Prelatiſts* aſſertion, 1. By *Scripture*, 2. By the *Records* of the firſt times, the *Writings* of thoſe who were neereſt the *Apoſtles*, and either affirme what was done by the *Apoſtles*, or how it ſtood practiced in the *Churches*, all the World over, which were planted by them. As for the *third* way of arguing from the *univerſall* conſent and practice of all *Churches* for about 1400. yeares together, *i.e.* from about the yeare 140. till the *Reformation*, this I doe not inſiſt on, as I might with all evidence, becauſe it is knowne and *confeſt* by the *Adverſaries*, and all that is by them pretended, is, that *parity* and *equality* being preſcribed and practiced by the *Apoſtles* ſoone after their death, and quite *contrary* to their plat-forme, *Prelacy* was introduced into all *Churches*; It being their deſire and demand now (a little different from what *Mr Calvin* at firſt propoſed to the

Churches of *Helvetia*) that all may be *reformed* and reduced to the ſtate wherein the *Apoſtles* left it.

6. In the managing the prooſes propoſed by mee, I have uſed this method, which ſeemed to mee moſt convincing. 1. To inſiſt on ſome *few Teſtimonies* under each head, which are ſufficient to conclude the matter on the *Prelatiſts* ſide; and then to propoſe ſome obſervations, which may accord all other places both of *Scripture* and *antient* writers, with thoſe *Teſtimonies* and that concluſion.

7. The ſpeciall prooſes of *Scripture* are taken, *Firſt*, from the *power* derived (as from *God* the *Father*, to *Chriſt*, ſo) from *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles*; not as to a *Common councell* of *ſociall Rulers*, but as ſo many *ſeverall planters* and *Governours* of the *Church*, each having all power committed to him, and depending on no conjunction of any one or more *Apoſtles* for the exerciſe of it; And this is largely and clearly deduced *Diſſert.* 3. *c.* 1. 2. 3. 4. And this *power* being by them derived to *Biſhops* in each *City*, in the ſame manner as they uſed it themſelves (which is alſo farther evidented and vindicated, *c.* 5. *&c.*) this was deemed a firſt competent proofe of this matter, and as a *confirmation* of it, it was obſervable, that the firſt *Biſhops* made by them, were in the very *Scripture* called *Apoſtles*, *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, &c. *Diſſ.* 4. *c.* 3.

8. A *ſecond principall* proofe of *Scripture* is taken from the ſeverall mentions of the ſo many *Churches* of *Aſia*, and the ſo many Angels aſſigned to them, one to each, as a *ſingular Governour* or *Biſhop* in the *Revelation*. And in diſcourſe of theſe wee have found great evidence of the fact to authorize us to *improve* the concluſion a little higher, than was *neceſſary* to the defence of the maine cauſe; *viz.* to affirme of theſe Angels, that each of them was an *Archbiſhop* or *Metropolitan*, and having done ſo to diſcerne upon undeniable grounds that there were many other ſuch, mentioned in the *Scripture* (though not under that title) as *James* the *brother* of the *Lord*, *Metropolitan* of all *Judea*, *Titus* of all *Crete*, with an *hundred* Cities in it, *&c.*

9. And the wayes of according all other *Scriptures* with theſe

theſe have been briefly theſe. 1. By obſerving this difference betwixt Cities and Metropoles, as the true cauſe and occaſion of the mentions of many *Biſhops* in (not of) one City, meaning thereby the *Biſhops* of all the Cities under that *Metropolis* as *Phil.* 1. 1. *Act.* 20. 17. *Secondly*, by examining the Nature of all the words, which I conceived to be uſed in *Scripture* for *Biſhops*, as (beſide *Apoſtle* and *Angel* forementioned) Ἐπίσκοπος, *Biſhop*, Ἡγούμενος, *Ruler*, Διδάσκαλος, *Doctor*, Ποιμήν, *Paſtor*, Πρῶτοι, *Preſident*, Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* (and in the *Fathers*, Ἀρχιερεύς, *Chiefe Prieſt*, and *Sacerdos*, *Prieſt*) each denoting *Dignity* and *Authority*, and all cleared to be in their own nature applicable, and by the circumſtances of the *Context* to be actually applied to the *ſingular Governours* in each *City*; moſt of them conſtantly ſo, and that one of Πρεσβύτερος, if not *conſtantly* ſo, yet very rarely otherwiſe. And this is done *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 7. and ſo to the end of that *Diſſ.* *Thirdly*, by obſerving the *paucity* of believers in many Cities in the firſt *Plantations*, which made it unneceſſary that there ſhould by the *Apoſtles* be ordeined any more than a *Biſhop* and *Deacon* (one or more) in each *City*, and that this was accordingly done by them at the firſt, is approved by the moſt undeniable *antient Records*. Such as thoſe Βαθυλάτου ἱστορίαι, the *profoundeſt Hiſtories*, out of which * *Epiphanius* makes this Obſervation; Ὅπου γέγονε χρεία, καὶ ἦσαν ἄξιοι ἐπισκοπῆς, καθεδήσαν ἐπίσκοποι πλήθους δὲ μὴ ὄντος οὐκ ἐυρέθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καθασθῶσι, καὶ ἠρκέθησαν ἑνὶ τῷ καθ' τοπὸν μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἄνευ δὲ διακόνου ἐπίσκοπον ἀδύνατον εἶναι, *Where there wanted* Biſhops, *and there were found perſons worthy of the Office*, Biſhops *were conſtituted*; *but where there was no multitude*, *there none were found among them to be conſtituted* Presbyters, *and they ſatisfied themſelves with a* Biſhop *alone in a place*; *Onely the* Biſhop *could not poſſibly be without a* Deacon, *and accordingly the* Apoſtle *tooke care that the* Biſhop *ſhould have his* Deacons *to miniſter to him.* That which is thus cited by *Epiphanius* out of thoſe *Antient* Records, is found clearly affirmed by * *Clemens Romanus*, an *Apoſtolicall* perſon, and witneſſe of the *Apoſtles* practice; that they being *ſent out by Chriſt*, *as hee by his Father*, *went*

* L. 1 *l.* 1.

* *Ep ad Cor.*

out Preaching the Gospell, and proclaiming it through Regions and Cities, καθίσανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς Ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *they constituted their first fruits into* Bishops *and* Deacons, *of those which should afterward believe.* To both which wee shall againe adde what *Ephiphanius prefaceth* in that place; Νέου ὄντος τοῦ κηρύγματος πρὸς τὰ ὑποπίπτοντα γράφαι Ἀπόστολων, *that when the preaching was new, the Apostle St.* Paul *wrote agreeably to the present state of affaires.* We have here so cleare an account of the reason of the *Apostles* immediate subjoyning of *Deacons* to *Bishops*, Phil.1.1. and 1 *Tim.*3. (*viz.* because those were the onely *two Orders* then constituted in every *Church*) that these two places (which are made use of by the *adversaries* against us) are most punctuall *evidences* of the Truth of ours, and of the *unseasonablenesse* of their pretentions.

10. As for the *Testimonies* out of the *first Antiquity*; The ground-worke I have chosen to lay in *Ignatius his Epistles*, because the *Testimonies* thence are so many and so evident, and the *Writer* so neere the *Apostles* time (that *holy* men being *Martyr'd* in the 10. of *Trajan*, to whose *Reigne* S. *John* lived) and most of his *Epistles* written to the very *Churches* of *Asia* planted by St. *John*, and the Bishops of many of them named by him, and of one *Bishop* the *Presbyters* under him, that if that one Authors Testimonies be attended to, there is an absolute decision of the whole matter on the *Prelatists* side; To which purpose I have also vindicated these Epistles from all that hath been objected to them in these late yeares, and asserted their *Authority* by as *antient* and *authentick* evidences, as can be vouched for any antient piece, next the Holy Scriptures themselves, and contented my selfe with the most *pure* and *uncorrupted Copies* and *Editions* of it.

11. In accord with these *Testimonies* I have also produced many others out of *Clemens Romanus*, *Hegesippus*, *Polycarpe*, *Papias*, *Polycrates*, *Iustin*, *Irenaus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, and as many of the first times as have said any thing to this matter, and found a full *consent* in all, and in most irrefragable *suffrages*, which conclude this whole *controversie* on the

the *Prelatists* side. To which I have also added some few observations of unquestionable truth, as 1. That of the continuance of the use of Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder*, to signifie *Bishop* (in our *Modern* sense) among some of these most *antient Church writers* (whereas the word Ἐπίσκοπος is never used by any, but for a *singular Governour*.) *Secondly*, that of the distinct *Congregations* of *Iewish* and *Gentile Christians* in the same *City* (the grounds of which are evident in *Scripture*) and consequently of the severall *Governours* or *Bishops* over them (which was usefull for the removing some seeming difficulties in the *Catalogues* of the *first Bishops* of *Rome*, *Antioch*, &c.) and some other the like, not for the serving the *Necessities* of our *Cause*, but as supernumerary, and *ex abundanti*. And upon these and such like heads of probation we have built our plea, descending also to a particular survey of *Saint Hierom's testimonies*, which are by the *adversaries* principally made use of against us.

And if what is thus *copiously* deduced in the *Dissertations*, together with *Answers*, and *refutations* of the principall *Objections* of *Doctor Blondel*, and *Walo Messalinus*, doe really stand in force, and appeare not to be refuted now in whole, or in part, by these men, who have often attempted to *refute* them, I shall then leave them seriously, and *Christianly* to consider but this one thing, and to returne their anger not to me, but to themselves, what *security* of grounds they can build upon in their present *practices*, particularly in their *assuming* to themselves that *power* or *authority* which doth not belong to them; For 1. if the *Prefecture* in each *Church* were (as by *Christ* to the *Apostles*, so) by the *Apostles* given to the *singular Governour* or *Bishop* (by them καθεστῶτα ἐπὶ πᾶσι, *constituted over all*) and from that time to this, regularly continued in a *succession* of *Bishops* in every *Church*; and secondly, if those which are now called *Presbyters*, were by those, who first instituted them, placed in a *second* rank as of *dignity*, so of *power*, and never had *all* that power committed to them, which to the *Bishop* was committed, particularly not that of *Ordeining* the meanest *Deacon*, much lesse *Presbyters* with power of *Ordeining* other *Presbyters*; and thirdly if they, on whose *au-*

thority,

thority they moſt depend (S.*Hierome the *Presbyter*, &c.)doe expreſly aſſure them, that the *Presbyters* in their times had not power of *Ordination*, but acknowledge the *Biſhop ſuperior* to the *Presbyter* in that (and it is not imaginable how that power ſhould be conveyed to any *Presbyter* now, which was not veſted in any at that time, nor pretended to be ſo in above a *thouſand* yeares after them.) And laſtly, if no man may take that which is not *given him from Heaven* (or give that which he hath not) which the *Scripture* yeilds to, as a rule by which both *John Baptiſt*, *John* 3. 27. and *Chriſt* himſelfe, *Luk*,12.14.was to be judged, and the *Apoſtle*, *Heb*.5.4. hath applied that generall rule to this particularity, of *Prieſthood* in the *Church*, viz. that no man may λαμβάνειν τιμὴν *aſſume an honour* to himſelfe, but who is ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καλούμενος, *called by God*, (θεοπεσβλήτως, *advanced by God*, ſaith *Theophylact*) either *immediately* or *mediately*, either by the *Apoſtles*, or by thoſe which received it *ſucceſſively* from them(all others being truly affirmed by the *Antients* ἐπιπηδᾶν τῇ τιμῇ, *to leap into the honour*, καὶ νόμον διαφθείρειν (*and to corrupt the rule* or *law* by which they ſhould be guided) then I ſay, upon what ſolid *grounds* can they ſatisfie *Conſcience*, who without all pretence of *neceſſity* (which by ſome is here made uſe of as an excuſe) the regular way being open and plaine before them, have *run* before they were *ſent*, *aſſumed* that *power* to themſelves, which belongs not to them,nor was ever by any, which had it, beſtowed upon them?

I doe not foreſee any more here neceſſary to be premiſed to our future debates, and ſhall therefore haſten to them, as to an *unpleaſant* progreſſe, that I would willingly be at the end of, and commit all to the *grace* and *unerring judgement* of him, whom we all profeſſe to *ſerve* and obey in this, as in all other things.

* Excepta Ordinatione, Hier. ep.85.ad Evagr. Χειροτονίαν μόνων ἀπολείπει τῶν ἀναβεβήκασι ἐπίσκοποι. Chryſoſt.Hom. in 1 Tom.

In Ep. ad Heb. P 913.

*Theophylact Ibid.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Angels of the Churches of Asia.

Section 1.

The grounds of affirming them to be Bishops.

FOr the *vindicating* of the *Dissertations* from all the *exceptions* which are offered against them in the *Booke*, which I have now before me; It is no whit necessary that I give the *Reader* any the most *cursory* view of the *whole Booke*; I shall therefore fall in, though abruptly, on the sixt Chapter of the *second part* of it. For although in some of the former Chapters of that part, some indeavours are used to assert *Presbytery* against *Episcopacy* by Arguments so frequently produced by that party, that they were every one foreseen; and in the *Dissertations* largely evidenced to have no validity in them, yet it falls out somewhat to mine owne and the *Readers* ease, that I am not *personally* called into the *lists*, till the beginning of the sixt Chapter; which by the *signall* of some *Latine* words in the Margine out of *Dissert.* 4. *c.* 4. *Sect.* 4. have markt me out as the person against whom that Chapter was intirely designed, and I shall readily answer the call, and not refuse the paines to examine every *Section* of that Chapter. Num. 1.

2. The subject of this Chapter is the *pretended* (as they please to stile it) *Episcopacy of the seven* Asian Angels, And thus they begin their assault; *The second Scripture ground brought to prove the Divine Right of Prelacy, is from the* Angels *of the seven Churches of* Asia; *These* Angels, *say they* (the Assertors of Prelacy) *were seven single persons, and* (*as one hath lately written*) *not onely* Bishops, *but Metropolitans and* Archbishops. *This is said with so much confidence that all men are condemned as blind or wilfull that endeavour to oppose it: And it is reckoned as one of the great prodigies of this unhappy Age, that Men should still continue blind,* In tantâ luce adhuc caecutire aliquos inter peritissimi & insuspicatissimi saeculi prodigia numerandum est;

blind, and not see light enough in this Scripture to build the great Fabrick of Episcopacy by Divine Right upon.

3. This is, it seemes, the first crime chargeable on mee as Author of the *Dissertations*, that I am confident of my Assertion, and *condemne all others as blind or wilfull that indeavour to oppose it.* And although this be no competent way of disproving what is asserted, for it is no *universall maxime* or *Datum* among the *Objecters* that confident asserting should be lookt on as a character of falsity, yet I, that would much more be ashamed to have beene presumptuous than mistaken, and deeme it not a sinne to have *erred modestly*, am concerned to avert the envy of this their *Proœme*, and to give this essay, how farre any the most *moderate* speeches may be disguised and deformed by a *disadvantageous* interpretation.

4. These words [*in tantâ luce*—] lie thus in the *Dissertations*; [Ad tertium accedo—*I proceede to the third thing, that which concernes the* Angels *in the Apocalypse, that by them are noted so many prefects of the chiefe Cities or Churches in* Asia, *whom you may call not onely* Bishops, *but* Primates, Enarchs, *or* Metropolitans. *Each of these things must be briefly taken notice of. First, that each of these were single and properly called* Bishops. *So* Andreas Cæsariensis *pronounceth of them,* Ἕπτα ἐκκλησίαις ἰσάριθμοι ἔφοροι ἄγγελοι λέγονται, *The seven* Ephori (Inspectors *or* Bishops, *so called from the* Greeke ἐπίσκοποι *Inspectors*, directly equivalent to ἔφοροι) *parallel to the number of the seven* Churches *are in that place of the Apocalypse called* Angels. *This title of* Angel *is sufficiently knowne from* Malach. 2. 7. *to belong to the chiefe Priest of the* Jewes, *for hee is called the* Angel *of the Lord of Hosts, as the person from whom the Law was to be derived to the people. Furthermore these* Angels *in that vision of* Johns *are likened to so many* Starres, *which, seeing* Christ *is said to beare or carry in his Right-hand* Apoc. 1. 16. 20. & 1, 2. *an argument of competent validity may be drawne from thence, that this dignity and power of them in the* Church *is, if not immediately instituted, yet approved and confirmed by* Christ; *especially when in these so many parts of this Epistle,* Christ *himselfe hath written to every*

of

of them under this title of honour and dignity. In the presence of so much light that some Men should still continue blind is to be numbered among the prodigies of this worst and most unhappy age. For as to that which from the one word [*your*] *in the plural.* c. 4. 24. *I finde objected by some against so many single mentions of the* Angels (*one in every* Church) *that will immediately vanish,* &c.

5. These words thus intirely set downe have a face very distant from that so much *confidence* and *censoriousnesse* that I am here charged with by the *Provinciall Synod*. For 1. For the *conclusion* deduced from the mention of these *Angels*, 'tis not the *Divine Right of Prelacy* (which phrase might yet have beene reconciled with rules of Sobriety and Modesty, as well as the *Jus Divinum* of Presbytery) but Christs approbation and confirmation of this *dignity* and power of Bishops, which conclusion hath evident grounds in those Texts which mention *Christ's holding them in his Hand*, and his addressing an *Epistle* to them, supposing onely, what is undertaken to be evidenced by other *mediums*, that these Angels were *single* persons in each *Church*.

6. Secondly, that which is by me so confidently affirmed, is not, as this learned *Assembly* is pleased to suggest, that these Angels were Metropolitans or Archbishops. That they were such, is afterwards as a distinct matter in the next Chapter proposed in a much more *moderate style*, *Statim credibile fiet*, *it will straitwayes become credible*, and with no more shew of confidence then the premises which are there at large set down, will Authorize.

7. These be *two* competent effayes to begin with, by which we may proportion our expectations; But there is yet a *third* which hath somewhat more of *injustice* in it, to mention my so much *confidence* in *asserting*, but never to take notice of the grounds produced, whereon this confidence (as farre as it extends) is built, the want of which is so constantly the one thing, which renders *confidence* unseasonable or blameable, that it is not in the power of any man to have apprehended grounds as proper to induce a *conclusion*, and to suspend the *belief* and *confidence* of the truth of that *conclu-*

sion, which is so inferred. The *injustice*, I say, is there not taking notice of the *mediums*, whereon the *confidence* is founded, very competent to inferre a conclusion in that stile, wherein it was there inferred, if they had been pleased to advertise their Readers of it.

8. The inference lies thus; The *Angel* of each Church of *Asia* was a *single* person, therefore not a *Colledge* or *Consistory* of Presbyters, and the singularity of the person is there supposed to be *evidenced* sufficiently by that which is so many times repeated in the *Text*, *the Angel of the* Church *of* Ephesus, *the* Angel *of the* Church *of* Smyrna, and the like, by the testimony of *Andreas Cæsariensis*, the Principall Annotator or Interpreter of the *Revelation*, transcribed by *Aretas* in expresse words, ἴσα ἐκκλησίαις ἀστέρες ἦσαν, *the number of the Bishops equall to the number of the Churches*; and by the answer rendred to that one *Objection* which is brought by the *Presbyterians* against the *singularity* of the person of each *Angel*.

9. Secondly, this *singular* person was a *Bishop* in that notion of the word which signifies a *precedence of power* and *dignity* over all others in that *Church*. This againe was made evident, both by the forementioned *singularity* of his power and person in each Church, and farther by the *propriety* of the title bestowed on him, an *Angel*, such as among the *Jewes* the *chiefe Priest* was styled; *Malac.* 2. to which matter I shall now superadde one Testimony which *Photius* hath out of *Diodorus Siculus* concerning the *Jewes*; Ἀρχιερέα τὸν μεταγορεύουσι, καὶ νομίζουσιν ἀὐτοῖς ἄγγελον γενέσθαι τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ προσταγμάτων, *Him they call the High Priest, and deeme him to be to them an Angel or Messenger of the commands of God* (a *Commissioner of Heaven*, impowered from thence for the execution of his *Office* among them.)

10. This by the way, gives us the reason of the *denomination*, because as *Angels* doe not onely carry up our *Prayers* to *God*, but also bring downe *Gods Commands* to us, so did the *High priest* under the *Law*. This *dialect* is also said to be derived from the *Hebrewes* to the *Ægyptians*, who call their *chiefe Priest Angel* also. And then how fitly the *parallel*

rank

runs betwixt the *High Priest* among the *Jewes*, and the *Bishop* in the *Christian Church*, taken in the *Prelatists* notion of him; was a theme which seemed not to need any length of *harangue* to performe or illustrate it. And yet after a Section spent to cleare that one difficulty of the [ὑμῖν, *you*, in the *plurall* c.2.24.] there are two Sections added more for the farther fortifying of this evidence. 1. From the Councell of *Chalcedon*; *Act.* 2. which * from *Timothy* till the time of their *Session* numbers 27. *Bishops* in one of these *Sees*, that of *Ephesus*, all ordeined there (and *Timothy* we know being ordeined by the laying on of St. *Pauls* hands 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. will divolve it to that *Orginall*, *Apostoliacll institution*) and 2. from *Polycrates*, † who was borne soone after St. *Johns* dayes, and is a witnesse of a competent *antiquity*, and affirmes himselfe to be the * eight *Bishop* of that *See*; From both which testimonies of the *Catalogue*, and number of *Bishops*, ascending to St. *Timothy*, as the first of that ranke (who certainly was constituted there before the Epistle of *Christ* to the *Angel* of that *Church*) the conclusion is obvious and irrefragable, that either *Timothy* or some *successor* of his was personally the *Angel* to which the *Epistle* was addrest, and I professe not to wish for a greater evidence to justifie a *Prelatist* in his desire to live in obedience to that order so signally confirmed by *Christ*.

* ἀπὸ τῦ ἁγίε Τιμοθέυ μέχρι νῦν καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἐγένοντο πάντες ὁ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐχειροτονήθησαν.

† *De Martyr. Timoth.*

* *Ep ad. Victor. ap Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 25.*

11. The like is in the next *Section* produced out of *Irenæus* l. 3. c. 3. concerning the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*. *Ireneus* lived in the time of *Polycarp* that antient *Primitive Martyr*, and being a youth had the honour to see that *venerable old Man*, and of him he affirmes, that he was * *not onely a Disciple of the Apostles, and conversed with many that saw Christ, but that also hee was sent to Asia, and constituted Bishop in the Church of* Smyrna; And if there needed any more light after so cleare and *authentick* a testimony (which againe concludes either *Polycarpe*, or some successor of his to be the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna* to whom

* ὁ μόνον δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον.

Christ addresseth his *Epistle*) there is another added out of *Tertullian*, a Writer of great *Antiquity* and reputation for knowledge in the *Records* of the *Church* in these words. * *As the Church of* Smyrna *relates* Polycarpe *to have been constituted there by* John, *as the Church of* Rome *affirmes* Clement *to have been ordeined by* Peter, *so in like manner the rest of the Churches exhibite the Records of those whom they have had their Bishops constituted by the Apostles and conveyers of the Apostolicall seed to them.* And more particularly of the *Churches* of *Asia*, the subject of our present discourse. * *We have the Churches fed by* John, *and the course of Bishops being driven to the Originall, acknowledge* John (*the Apostle*) *to be the Author of them.* Here certainly is light enough to make some *confidence* excusable in a *Prelatist*, and to make his *wonder* seasonable, that any that have eyes, should in so cleare a *Sunshine* want the *use* of them, and to thinke it no very *auspicious omen* that they doe. Yet because I had much rather assist, then upbraid other mens infirmities, I have here given them an instance how easie it had been for them to have informed themselves and their *respective charges* of the *grounds* of the *Prelatists confidence*, that the *Epistle* of *Christ* to the *Angels* of the seven *Asian* Churches was an evidence of his approbation of the Order of *Bishops* in our *moderne* notion of that word for a *single overseer* in every *Church*.

* *Sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia Polycarpum à Johanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit, perinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatū constitutos, Apostolici seminis traductores habent. De Præscrip. c. 32.*

* *Habemus Johannis alumnas Ecclesias—— Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recensus in Johannem stabit auctorem.* Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 5.

12. And if there be any obscurity still remaining in the premises, because the Councell of *Chalcedon* (and *Policrates*) makes *Timothy*, who was ordained by *Paul* the first *Bishop* or *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus*, but *Tertullian* divolves the *Originall* of the course or Catalogue to St *John*, the answer is easy, that there were two sorts of *Christians* in *Ephesus*, and throughout all *Asia*, the first of *Gentile* converts, brought into the faith by St. *Paul* the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, and over them it was that *Timothy* was by him placed in *Ephesus* their

their *Bishop*; the second of *Jewish Proselites* converted by St. *John* (by compact designed to goe to the *Jewes*, as his *Province* Gal. 2. 9. and those peculiarly the *Asian Jewes*, as appeares every where in * *Eusebius* story, and by the relation of his death in that place, given us by † *Polycrates*, an early *Bishop* there) and the Author of the *constitutions* out of an antient *tradition* tells us that another of the same name, Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννου μαχαιροποίητος) was by that *Apostle ordained Bishop* of the *Jewish Christians* there, as *Timothy* by S. *Paul* of the other Congregation of *Gentile Christians*. An observation which is largely educed and exemplified in the * *Dissertations*, and of which there is no small use for the *dilucidating* of *obscurities in antient* story, and the clearing of this controversy betwixt us and the *Presbyterians*; but I must not here take liberty to inlarge on it unnecessarily, having beene thus farre forced to expatiate somewhat above proportion to the length of their owne period, wherein my *confidence* and *censoriousnesse* were shortly accused, how deservedly, I hope hath now been made manifest.

* τὰς ἀνὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν διοικήσεις ἐκκλησιας l. 3. 23.

† Ibid. c. 31.

* *Dissert.* 4. c. 1. & 7. &c.

Section II.

Of Timothy, *of* Onesimus, *of* Polycarpe.

The next period in their charge against mee runs thus. *It is farther added, that some of the Antient Fathers mention the very men that were the Angels of those Churches. Some say* Timothy *was Bishop of* Ephesus, *when* John *wrote his Epistle to it; Others say* Onesimus, *others say that* Policarpe *was Bishop of* Smyrna; *And from hence they conclude with a great deale of plausibility, that the Angels of the Churches were severall individuall Bishops.* Num. 1.

2. Here is as yet no great charge offered, but a confession rather, that I had some temptation for the *confidence*, of which I was formerly accused, my *conclusion* being acknowledged by the adversaries to be *inferred with a great deale of plausibility*. But I have not so much reason to depend on their *civilities*, as to omit the inserting here, what may be useful

to

to prevent mistakes, and, shall therefore thinke it necessary to set downe intirely, what it is which I have affirmed in this matter.

3. And 1. I have yet no where said that *Timothy* was *Bishop* of *Ephesus* when *John* writ this *Epistle* to that *Church*; My words are expressly otherwise, *Ex quibus patet vel* Timotheum *ipsum vel aliquem ei succedaneum hunc ipsum Angelum fuisse, quem* c.2.1. *Christus alloquitur. By which it appeares* (having formerly set down my *grounds* to induce this *conclusion*) *that either* Timothy *himself, or some body that succeeded him, was that very Angel to whom Christ addrest his speech,* c.2.1: But that is not to affirme it of *Timothy*, but purposely to absteine from affirming any thing that could be denyed or doubted, and onely to affirme it *either* to *Timothy* or some *successor* of his, which evidently and infallibly it must be, if there be truth in the premise from which it was inferred, the words of the *Councell*, and the *Father*, that after *Timothy*, the first, succeeded of *continuall* series of *Bishops* there.

4. What my opinion is in this matter, I shall now freely tell them, though before I had not occasion to doe it, together professing it to be onely my *opinion*, and so still *affirming* nothing in a matter of some *uncertainty*, or farther than the grounds, on which my *opinon* is founded, shall appeare able to support it. My opinion briefly is, that *Timothy* was then *Bishop* of *Ephesus* at the time of addressing that *Epistle* to the *Angel* of that *Church*; And the *grounds* are these. 1. That St. *Johns* banishment and prophesying are by *Epiphanius* twice expressly affirmed to have been ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος, *in the times of Claudius Cæsar*; Then secondly, that as it is by *Chronologers* set downe to be in the 13. of *Claudius*, that *Timothy* was left by *Paul* at *Ephesus*, when hee went into *Macedonia*; 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *Act.* 20. so it is generally resolved that *Timothy* suffered at *Ephesus* under *Nerva*, and that agreeable enough with his age, who appeares to be *young* when *Paul* first placed him *Bishop* of *Ephesus*. If these grounds have truth in them, then *Timothy* cannot be doubted to be *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, when St *Johns* vision was received; And though 'tis true, that *Irenæus* seemes to assigne another *date* of

Hær. Αλογ.

of these *visions*, at least of some of them, πρὸς τῷ τέλει Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς, *at the end of* Domitians *Reigne* (which what it is to be deemed to signifie, is * elsewhere explained) yet still that is within the compasse of *Timothies* life, if hee suffered not till *Nerva's* Reigne. And so much for that of *Timothies*. *Annot.p. 906.*

5. Secondly, that *Onesimus* was *Bishop* of *Ephesus* at the *date* of that *Epistle*, is no where so much as intimated to be my opinion, much lesse affirmed by me. And therefore I need reply no more to that. Yet because *Ignati*[illegible]his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* mentions *Onesimus* their *Bish*[illegible] and that *Testimony* is produced by me *Dissert.*2.c.25.Sect.9. I shall here freely give them my opinion also of that matter.

6. First, that there is little ground of *question*, but that one of that name, *Onesimus*, was *Bishop* of *Ephesus* in the tenth yeare of *Trajan*, wherein *Ignatius* wrote that *Epistle*.

7. Secondly, that by one indication there is some small reason to guess, that this *Onesimus* was then lately come to that dignity; I meane *Ignatius* his words of gratulation to that *Church*, that *God* had *given them the favour to obtaine or have such a Bishop*; εὐλογητὸς ὁ χαρισάμενος ὑμῖν τοιούτοις οὖσι τοιοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον κεκτῆσθαι.

8. Thirdly, that according to *Epiphanius* his setting down the time of *John's* banishment and *visions*, in the dayes of *Claudius*, there must be above 50 yeares distance between the *date* of this *Epistle* of *Christ*, and that of *Ignatius*, and consequently that it is not so likely that *Onesimus*, that was their *Bishop* in the later, should be that very *Angel* in the former.

9. Fourthly, that as I can have no cause to consent with *Ado* (*in lib.de Fest.Apost.ad* 14. *Cal. Mart.*) that this *Onesimus* in *Ignatius* was hee that is mentioned by St.*Paul* to *Philemon*, so nor to adhere to the *Roman Martyrologie*, that he whom *Paul* mentions, was constituted *Bishop* of *Ephesus* after *Timothy*.

10. And therefore *fiftly*, it must be remembred, that both the *Greeke Menologies*, and *Simeon Metaphrastes* (who

celebrate his memory on *March* 13.) acknowledge not that *Onesimus* to have been at all *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, and that others also of the *antients* make him to have been *Bishop* of *Berœa*, and *martyr'd* in *Domitian's* Reigne: and *Dorotheas* in *Synopsi* expressly affirmeth that *Gaius* succeeded *Timothy* in *Ephesus*.

11. From all which it followes, that *Onesimus* mentioned by *Ignatius*, was some later *Bishop* of that City, who bare that very *Ordinary Greeke* name, and so that his being *Bishop* of *Ephesus* no way belongs to that time of the *Angel* in the *Revelation*, [illegible] interferes with their opinion, who thinke *Timothy* to have beene that *Angel*; The appearing incompetibility whereof was it, I sppose, that brought in here the mention of *Onesimus*.

12. This was here seasonable enough to be confronted to their words in this place, and will be of use to be remembred in the *processe* of their *Discourse*.

13. Thirdly, for *Polycarp's* being *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, as there is left no place for the doubting of that (if either *Irenæus*, that lived in his time and *saw* him, or if *Tertullian*, who lived not long after, and was a curious *Antiquary*, may be believed in their joynt affirmations of a knowne matter of *Fact*) so it is againe no where affirmed by me, that hee was the *very* man, to whom that *Epistle* to the *Angel* of *Smyrna* was sent, and if that were their meaning, they have againe *misreported* my words.

14. All that I had said, I thinke was proved irrefragably, that in two of those *Churches* mentioned in the *Apocalyps*, *Timothy* and *Polycarpe* are by *Anthentick testimonies* affirmed to be constituted *Bishops*, the one by St. *Paul*, the other by St. *John*, and that is a competent argument added to others, to inferre that the *Angel* of each of those *Churches* was a *single* person, and so a *Bishop* in the *Prelatists*, not in the *Presbyterians* notion of the word, an assertion which I need not feare will yeild any advantage to the *adversaries*, and so I as briefly commit it to them.

Section

Section 3.

Of the negative Argument from St. John's *not using the word Bishop. Of* Πρεσβύτερος *in the Revelation.*

IN the next place by way of *answer* to this plea of the *Prelatists*, we are referred to three writings of their party, *Smectymnuus*, the *Vindication of Smectymnuus*, the *Humble Addresses of the Divines at the Isle of* Wight, wherein, say they, *these things are fully, clearely, and satisfactorily handled.* Num. 1.

2. But it being certaine that every one of these three was publisht some yeares before the *Dissertations*, I should thinke it strange that the particulars there insisted on by me, should by *divination* be thus *answered* before their *conception*, being able truly to professe, that though I am not unwilling to make use of any mans aid for defending truth, yet none of those writings, to which any of those three were given in *answer*, were by me made use of in those *compositions*.

3. But we are superseded the trouble of examining any of these three, by the *leave* that is *craved* to *borrow* from them what may be *usefull* for the turne, and then in like manner I shall more willingly receive from these, what shall appeare to answer, or prejudge our plea, than undertake new troubles in farther unnecessary search of it.

4. First, then they desire it may be *considered, that S.* John, *the Penman of the Revelation doth neither in it, nor in any of his other writings so much as upon the by*; I suppose, for the Printer failes me) *name* Bishop. *Hee names the name* Presbyter *frequently in the Revelation, yea, when he would set out the office of those who are neerest the throne of Christ in his Church*, Rev. 4. *he calls himselfe a* Presbyter, *Ep.* 2. *And whereas in S.* John's *dayes some new expressions were used in the Christian Church, which were not in Scripture, as the Christian Sabbath began to be called the Lords day, and Christ himselfe the Word, now both these are found in the writings of St* John; *And it is strange to us that the Apostle should mention a new phrase, and not mention a new Office erected by this time (as our Brethren say) in the Church, especially if wee consider that* Polycarpe

(as is related) was made Bishop by him; And no doubt if hee had been made Bishop in a prelaticall sense, we should have found the name Bishop in some of his writings, who lived so long as to see Episcopacy setled in the Church, as our Adversaries would make us believe.

5. We are now to consider what degree of *conviction*, or Argument, to the *prejudice* of our *pretensions*, can be fetcht from this large *consideration*. And first it is most evident and notorious among all Artists, that an argument from *Authority* cannot conclude *negatively* that there were no Bishops in St *John's* time, because St. *John* doth not mention Bishops. It is the same way of arguing, as if they should conclude that there was no *God* in the time of writing the *Canonicall Chapters* of *Hester*, because God is not found once mentioned in those *Chapters*. And yet of this *inartificiall* kinde is the whole discourse of this *Paragraph*, the premisses barely *negative* throughout all the *consideration*; And so nothing is conclusible from it to the *prejudice* of us, or *benefit* of our adversaries.

6. Secondly, all that this *consideration* pretends to, is terminated in the bare name of *Bishop*, that is it which they pretend is not to be found in St *John*. But 1. They knew that the word *Angel* is oft in St *John*, and by us contested, by the *singularity* of the person one *Angel* in each *Church* (and other Characters) to conclude the *Office* of *Bishop* as irrefragably, as if the word *Bishop* were there specified. Nay of this wee have a competent experience, that if the word *Bishop* had been found there, it would by *Presbyterians* be as readily expounded to signifie a Presbyter, or *colledge* of such (for so certainly they have done in other places) and truly with as much *reason* and satisfaction to any *impartiall* judge, as they have affirmed the word *Angel* in each *Church* to denote such. And therefore

7. Thirdly, I shall demand, would the *Apostle* St. *John's* using the name *Bishop*, be at all usefull to the *Prelatists* interests, to conclude that there was such an *Office* in the *Church* in his time, or would it not? If not, then sure it is not to our *prejudice*, that hee hath not mentioned that name, and then this

this whole *consideration* is perfectly to no purpose. If it would, then sure St. *Pauls* and St. *Lukes* frequent mentions of them (I may adde St. *Peter* also) will supply St. *John's* omissions, and conclude there were *Bishops* in their time, and that was long before St. *Johns* death, if it had been considered.

8. Fourthly, when it is said that St. *John* frequently names the name *Presbyter* in the *Apocalyps*, 'tis not imaginable that they should thinke the *Author* of the *Dissertations* could receive any prejudice from thence, when hee hath avowed to believe that those Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, mentioned in those so many places of the *Revelation*, were the 24. *Bishops* of *Judea* sitting in *Councell* at *Jerusalem* their *Metropolis*, encompassing *James* the *Bishop* there together with the *foure living creatures*, denoting the foure *Apostles* that were joyned with them in the *councell*, and the 7. Lamps, the emblemes of the 7. *Deacons* attending; Of which matter till they have disproved what is commodiously deduced *Dissert.* 4. c. 20. *Sect.* 10. I shall have no need farther to inlarge, it being perfectly useless to our present inquiry, that either the word *Bishop* or *Elder* should be used by S. *John*, for a single *Prefect* in the *Christian Church*, supposing (as now we do in the *Objection*, and tis but a begging of the *question* in the *respondent* to suppose the *contrary*) that the word *Angel* is a notation of it.

9. By this it appeares fiftly, how little wee incommodated by the *position* of these *Elders* in the *Revelation* placed neerest to the *throne* of *Christ* in his Church, for supposing, as I doe, that *Christ* is by way of *vision* represented there under the person of the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem* sitting in *councell*, and encompassed (on each side) with a *Semicircle* of *Thrones*, on which sat the 24 *Bishops* of *Judea*, I can well allow these 24. (call them *Elders*, or what you please) to be neerest to that *middle throne*, whereon *Christ* is seated. And truely if it should be otherwise interpreted of Presbyters in the *moderne* notion of the word, it would be hard to make the other parts of the *vision* to beare proportion with that phansy; For I must suppose, according to St. *John's* words, that in the *vision* these *thrones* were set up in *Heaven*; And then I shall demand, was that a *representation* of any *councell* or *Judicature* on *Earth*,

or not? If it were not, then nothing can be inferred thence in favour of *Presbyters*, more than of *Bishops*, for of both these we speake, as of *Officers* on Earth; But if it were, then applying it to *Presbyters*, it must follow, that in the *midst* of them there is some other (invironed on each side by them) καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, *sitting upon that throne of principall dignity*, before whom also they on the *other thrones* must *fall downe* v.10. (or else the *parallel* will not hold throughout) and the least that can be signified hereby, will be *superiority* of *dignity* in him that sits on that *middle throne* above all the 24. *Elders*, which will be deemed to exceede the case of a *Prolocutor* or *Moderator* of an *Assembly*, which is the utmost that the *Presbyterian* Ἰσοτιμία or *equality* can admit of, but much more commodiously agrees to the *Metropolitan* of all *Iudea*, sitting in a *Nationall Councell* with the *Bishops* about him, for of these we doubt not to affirme that they were as much inferior to him, as this *representation* doth pretend them to be.

10. As for the sence affixt to it by the *Assemblers*, that the πρεσβύτερος are *Presbyters* in the *moderne* notion, and that he that sits in the *midst* of them is *Christ*, this is against all *analogy*, and rules of interpreting, a mining and confounding the *Originall* with the *Copy*, the *type* with the *Antitype*, interpreting one part of the *vision*, as if it were in *Heaven* (for it was there where *Christ* did sit as *Iudge*) and the other as if it were on *Earth*, for sure the *Presbyters* in this notion are to be considered as there; And this is a very sufficient prejudice against their interpretation (if there were not enough besides) and such as no way presseth our way of setting it, as hath been already manifested.

11. Sixtly, for his calling himselfe a *Presbyter Ep.* 2. I answer, that as farre as this allegation hath truth, it hath no *force* in it at all against our pretentions. He doth indeed call himselfe ὁ πρεσβύτερος (the *Elder*, we fitly render it) noting thereby (according to *analogy* with the solemne notion of the word both among *sacred* and *prophane* Writers, set downe at large *Dissert.*4.c.19.) a person of *authority* in the *Church* of *Christ*; an *Apostle* first, and then the *Supreme Governour* of the

the whole *Iewish Church* in *Asia*, which is but proportionable to Saint *Pauls* beginning his *Epistles* with *Paul an Apostle* (or *Commissioner*) *of Iesus Christ* (placed in that power in the *Church* by *Christ* himselfe) and with the same style in the front of Saint *Peters Epistles*, onely with this *Characteristick* note peculiar to Saint *John* in his *Gospell* and *Epistles*, of omitting the expression of his owne name; And then all that this text is of force to doe, is to prove that the word Πρεσβύτερος doth not import a *Presbyter* (in our *moderne* use of the word) governing in *common* with other *Presbyters*, but rather a *singular Governor* of the *Church*, such as *Bishops* are by us contested to be; And so the *Greek Scholiasts* have expressed it, ὄνομα τοῦτο ἐαυτὸν καλῶν διὰ τῆς Πρεσβύτερος, *By the word Elder he calls himselfe Bishop*. And this, 'tis certaine, is for the interest of the *Author* of the *Dissertations*, and no way to his prejudice, if it had been adverted by them that produce it.

12. *Seventhly*, when 'tis said that in *Saint Iohn's dayes some New expressions were used in the Christian Church, which were not in Scripture*, as the *Lords day*, and the *Word*, I professe not to comprehend what advantage to their prætensions could be designed or aimed at in this part of the *consideration*: For 1. how can it truly be said, that the word Κυριακὴ, *Lord's day*, which is in the *Revelation*, and ὁ Λόγος, *the Word*, which is in Saint *Iohn's Gospell*, were not in *Scripture*? I must suppose the meaning is, that they were not in any other writings of *Scripture*, except Saint *Iohn's*: But then 2. that doth not infer them to be *new expressions* in *Saint Iohn's dayes*, as these dayes are distinguisht from the *dayes* of the *other Apostles*, whom *Iohn* survived, but only that they were *idiomes* or *characters* of speech that *Saint Iohn* delighted to make use of.

13. Thus indeed 'tis ordinarily observed of his *expressing* of *Christ* by ὁ Λόγος *the word*, which yet is taken from the *Ancients* of the *Jewish Church* (the *Chaldee paraphrase* being knowne frequently to use מימר דיי *the word of the Lord*, and *Plato* seems to have been acquainted with the expression, which caused *Amelius* to sweare at the reading the beginning of.

of *S. John's Gospell*, that that *Barbarian* was of their *Plato's* mind, that the *word* of *God* was in *order* of a *Principle*) and perhaps not peculiarly to him appropriate, for * *Budæus* a very learned *Critick* in *Greek* affirmes *Saint Luke* to have used it in this notion, cap. 1. 2. and if he doth not, yet still 'twill be but a peculiar part of *Saint John's* style, which if he had written his *Gospell* in the same yeare that *Saint Matthew* did his, he would doubtlesse have made use of, the phrase being certainly in the world before that time (and so not *new*, as they would have it) and the usage of it in the Church being in all reason to be derived from *Saint John's* use of it (who was from thence called θεόλογος *the Divine*) not *Saint John's* use of it from the *new admission* of it into the *Christian Church*.

* In Pandect. pag. 31.

14. And for the word Κυριακὴ, *Lord's day*, as it is not certaine that it is the *Christian Sabbath* (I meane the *weekly Lord's day*,) which is meant by that title once used in the *Revelation*, but as probably the *feast* of *Easter*, the *annual commemoration* of *Christ's* rising from the *dead* (and accordingly *Andreas Cæsariensis* sets it indifferently, yet so as it seems rather to incline to the *later*, Κυριακὴ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χριστοῦ μνημόσυνον φέρουσα, *the Lord's day bearing the memorial of the resurrection of Christ*) so in what notion soever it be taken, it was against *Saint Iohn's* use of the word that gave it *authority* in the following dialect of the *Church*, not the *Churches* usage (that we any where can discerne) from whence *Saint Iohn* derived it; And so this will be an instance as ineffectual as the former, to inferre the conclusion to which it is designed: For indeed bating the *unskilfulnesse* of the *argument*, *ab authoritate negativè*, already mentioned, what a strange way of concluding would this be? *S. Iohn* useth the words [ὁ Λόγος, *the word*] and [Κυριακὴ, *Lord's day*] (supposing also, that 'tis true which is added) and no other *writer* of the *Scripture* useth them but in stead of them, [*the Sonne of God*] (*Messias*, *Christ*) and the [*first day of the week*] therefore if there had been any *office* of *Bishops* erected in the *Church* in Saint *John's* time, it is strange that Saint *John* should not mention the name Ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop*: 'Tis at the first hearing cleare enough

nough, that there is no *strangeneſſe* in this, both becauſe Saint *John* undertooke not to ſet downe a *Dictionary* of all words or cuſtomes which were in his time in the *Church*, and becauſe there is no proportion held betwixt the members of the *compariſon*, as hath been ſhewed. And it will yet be leſſe ſtrange, becauſe 1. it is eaſily ſuppoſeable and not ſtrange, that he ſhould have no occaſion at all to mention that office, or that mentioning it, he ſhould doe it in his owne choſen expreſſion, Ἄγγελος *Angel*, or πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* (as in other greater matters he is acknowledged and allowed to doe) by either of thoſe ſignifying the ſame thing as expreſſely as the uſing of Ἐπίσκοπος *Biſhop* would have done: And 2. it is otherwiſe as manifeſt by Saint *Paul* and Saint *Luke*, that the word Ἐπίσκοπος *Biſhop*, and the office belonging to it were before the time of Saint *John*'s writings uſed in the *Church*, as it could be, if Saint *John* had made expreſſe mention of it.

15. And laſtly, for the higheſt round in the κλίμαξ, the ſpecial part of the *conſideration*, our affirmation that *Polycarp* was made *Biſhop* by Saint *John*, that doth not (any more than all the reſt) inferre it neceſſary that Saint *John* ſhould mention the name *Biſhop*: Saint *Jude*, I hope, is ſuppoſed by the *Aſſemblers* to have conſtituted ſome *Presbyters* in the *Church*, and yet he in his *Epiſtle* hath made no mention of any ſuch *name* or *office*. And ſo much for that firſt *conſideration*.

Section IV.

Of Saint John's *writings. Againe of* Diotrephes.

A Second *conſideration* now followes to be added to this, Num. 1.
That there is not any the leaſt intimation in all S. John's *writings, of the ſuperiority of one Presbyter over another, ſave onely where he names and chides* Diotrephes, *as one ambitiouſly affecting ſuch a Primacy.*

2. A *conſideration* of the ſame unhappy conſtitution with the former, 1. *a teſtimonio negativè* againe, Saint *John* had no occaſion to mention it, therefore there was in his time no

such thing, and 2. in respect of the matter just the same againe, put only in other words; there 'twas, [No mention of *Bishop* in all Saint *John*'s writings,] here, [No *superiority* of one *Presbyter* over another in all Saint *John*'s writings.] And so it can adde no accumulation of weight to the former.

3. But then 2. (bating againe those two infirmities in discourse) what if it were granted that at the time of Saint *John*'s writing, there were not in the *whole Church* of *Christ* any one *Presbyter*, superior to another *Presbyter*, what hath the *Author* of the *Dissert*: lost, or they gained by this? He makes no doubt willingly to yeild to any inforcing reason that is or shall be produced to conclude that at that time, there was above *Deacons* but *one degree* in the *Church*, and yet to be never the lesse qualified to maintaine his prætensions, Nay he is knowne to have expressed it as his opinion probably inferred, and not easily confuted (and that by which, if it be true, or because there is no *evidence* to the contrary, all the *Presbyterian* prætensions, founded in the *doubtfulnesse* of words in *Scripture*, are utterly excluded) that there were not in the space within compasse of which, all the *Bookes* of the *New Testament* were written, any *Presbyters* in our *Moderne* notion of them, created in the *Church*, though soon after, certainely in *Ignatius*'s time, there were; and then if the *consideration* now before us were of any force at all, this would be the one direct and proper use of it, to adde more *confidence* to this opinion, and so to *confirme*, not to *invalidate* our *pratensions*.

4. Thirdly for *Diotrephes* and Saint *Iohn*'s chiding of him for *ambitiously affecting* a *Primacy* over other *Presbyters*, there will appeare to be more than one misadventure in it. For 1. it is apparent in the *Text* that this *Diotrephes* (whom *Walo Messalinus* a good friend to the prætensions of the *Assemblers*, describes so, as will conclude him a meere *Presbyterian*, *Noluit*, saith he, *agnoscere superiorem aliquem in Presbyteros habentem potestatem, he would not acknowledge any superior having power over Presbyters*) contended for *superiority*, not onely over his *equals*, but over Saint *Iohn* himselfe, ὃς ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς, saith that *Apostle*, he *receiveth not us*, yeilds

* Pag. 24.

yeilds no *obedience*, gives no *heed* to our *letter* of directions; This certainly belongs not to the *superiority* or *dignity* of *Bishops*, which reserves the *Primacy* to the *Apostles* intire, and no way clasheth with it, and onely pretends to that power and *office* of duty, which for the preserving of *unity*, and the good of the *flock*, the *Apostles* thought fit to intrust and commit to them.

5. *Secondly*, *Diotrephes* was not (as farre as appeares, or we have reason to conjecture) *ordained* to any *office* of power in the *Asian Church*, committed to that *Apostles* care, but of himselfe without any *mission*, nay expressely against the *Apostles* consent, was willing to *assume* and exercise this *power*, and is but an example of *Corah*'s sedition and presumptuous humour (and that is inevitably the case of the *Presbyterian*, unlesse he can shew his *commission* for the *power* he pretends to) all one with that of the *Gnosticks* censured by Saint *Jude* under the style of ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορέ the *gainesaying of Corah*, and this no way belongs, or is appliable to the *practice* of the *Bishop*, who by *Commission* from the *Apostle*, not by any *ambition* or *presumption* of his owne, regularly ascends to this *degree* of *office* and *dignity* in the *Church*, and useth it as regularly also, in subordination to all his *superiors*.

6. On this Occasion the *Dissertations* have offered a *Dilemma* to these *Disputants*, which I should be willing to heare answered by them, in this forme, Either *Diotrephes* exercised in the *Church* the power of the *Bishop*, in the notion of a *singular Præfect*, assuming power over the *Presbyters*, or he did not; If he did not, then is this *consideration* presently at an end, *Diotrephes* is falsly accused, and the *innocent Bishop* unjustly wounded through his sides, who it seems was no *Bishop*: But if it be said he did, then I demand, Why is not *Diotrephes* checkt by S. *John* for that *presumption* of affecting a power over his *equals*? And why doth the whole charge lye another way, that he received not S. *John*'s *Letters*, nor paid due *obedience* to them? Or why is that very thing charged so heavily on the *Bishops* in our age, and punisht so severely in them, which the *Apostle* living and seeing, and upon occasion taking notice of *Diotrephes* his insolence, doth not so much as reprehend or accuse in him?

7. For as to the *Epithet* which he bestowes upon him, that he was φιλοπρωτευών, one that *loved the præeminence*, supposing that were the title of his *fault*, yet that extends not the *Apostles* speech to *censuring* or blaming the *use* of that power, but onely the *ambition* and *affectation* of it, which were otherwise lawfull to be enjoy'd; as when tis noted in the *Pharisees*, that they did φιλεῖν πρωτοκαθεδρίας, *love* or *affect* the *uppermost seats* in the *Synagogues*, which otherwise *simply* to have sat in, had implyed no *crime* of theirs, for to this very end, that some body should *sit* in them, they were certainly *erected*, and 'tis known that there was among them a ראש הקהל *head of the Consistory*, an ἀρχισυνάγωγος & *Governor* of the *Synagogue*, to whom that *seat* belonged by *God*'s appointment.

8. Nay for the very *desire*, as farre as is expresst by ὀρέγεσθαι or ἐπιθυμεῖν 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. *desiring* and *coveting*, it is allowed by the *Apostle* to be terminated in ἐπισκοπὴ the *office* of a *Bishop*, καλὸν ἔργον, as a *good*, and consequently a *desireable worke*, and if *Diotrephes* be supposed guilty of any other, it may safely be yeilded to have been a *fault* in him, without præjudice to the *good office* which he so *vitiously* and *criminously* affected, according to that of * *Theodoret*, that the *Apostle*, οὐκ ἁπλῶς τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς φιλαρχίας κατηγορεῖ, *accuses not the desire simply, but the desire of rule*, καὶ διδάσκει μὴ τιμῆς ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ὀρέγεσθαι, μὴ τιμὴν ἀξίαν ποθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀξίας τὸ ἔργον ἐπιζητεῖν, *and teacheth to desire, not the honour, but the vertue, not to covet the dignity, but to seeke the worke of the dignity*, the *taske* to which it belongs. By all which, and much more added in the * *Dissertations*, it is evident, how little advantage hath accrued to the *Assemblers* from their mention of *Diotrephes* out of Saint *John*, and by consequence from their *second consideration*.

* In 1 Tim. 3. 1

* Dissert. 1. cap. 13.

Section

Section V.

Of St. John's *being Bishop of* Asia. *Of the Apostles being Bishops.*

NOw succeeds a *third consideration*. viz. *That the same Authors that say that S.* John *made* Polycarpe *Bish. of* Smyrna, *& that S.* Peter *made* Ignatius *Bishop of* Antioch, *do also say that St.* John *himselfe sat many yeares Bishop of* Ephesus, *and was the Metropolitan of all* Asia, *which (say they) is an evident demonstration to us, that these Authors did not use the word Bishop in a Prelaticall sense. For it is certaine that the Apostles cannot be properly called Bishops; For though they doe eminently containe the Episcopall Office, yet they were not formally Bishops. For this were to degrade the Apostles, and to make their Office Ordinary and perpetuall, this were to exalt the Bishop above his degree, and make him an Apostle, and to make the Apostle a Bishop. It doth not much differ from madnesse, to say that* Peter *or any one of the Apostles were properly Bishops, as learned* Whitaker *saith, whom wee shall have occasion to cite to this purpose hereafter.* Numb. 1.

2. Whether this *consideration* be likely to contribute any thing to their advantage, save onely by *amusing* the Reader, and keeping him longer in expectation, that somewhat may possibly be produced to the disparagement of our plea, I desire may distinctly be considered by these *degrees*.

3. First, I acknowledge that stile [*the same Authors*—] to belong truly to antient Writers produced by mee in the *Dissertations*, who, as they doe affirme St. *John* to have constituted *Policarpe Bishop* of *Smyrna*, *Diss.* 4. c. 5. Sect. 5. and St. *Peter* to have placed *Ignatius Bishop* of *Antioch*. *Diss.* 5. c. 1. Sect. 18. so they consent also that St. *John* sat *Bishop* of *Ephesus* and *Metropolitane* of all *Asia*: so * *Eusebius* frequently, that after his returne from his banishment τὰς ἀνὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν διέπειν ἐκκλησίας, he *administred* or *governed the Churches* there, *i.e.* in *Asia*; and (as he cites it lib. 3. cap. 31. out of *Policrates* his *Epistle*) died there. So the antient Writer of the *Martyrdom* of *Timothy*, in *Photius* † Ὑφηγεῖται δὲ Νεφὼν τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας διαδοχὴν τῷ Ἐφεσίων ἐπισκόπῳ Μυλεσπόλει καὶ ἀνδρὶ θείῳ καὶ ἁγιωτάτῳ

* *L.* 3. c. 23.

† *Biblioth.* Num. 254.

συμπαρόντων ἐπισκόπων τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἀντιλαμβανέται Μητροπόλεως, *Being recalled by* Nerva's *decree, he sat downe at* Ephesus, *and himselfe personally, with seven Bishops his adsessors* (those in all probability the *Bishops* of the *seven Churches* in the *Revelation*) *hee governed the Metropolitan City of Ephesus* that prime *Metropolis* of all *Asia*, to the *Bishop* whereof, saith † *Chrysostome*, was intrusted ὅλην ὅλως τῆς Ἀσίας, *the whole Nation of* Asia; These testimonies may suffice for the substance of the *affirmation* that St. *John* governed the *Church* of *Ephesus*, and under it all *Asia*, which is the notion wee now have of a *Bishop Metropolitane* and *Primate*.

† *Hom.* 15. in 1 Tim. 5. 19.

4. As for the word *Bishop*, how can it be inconvenient to bestow that upon him, when hee discharged the *Office*, nay when *Christ* himselfe that great *exemplar* and *original* of this power, is expressly called the *Bishop* of our *Soules*, as well as the *Apostle*; when the *Office* from which *Judas* fell, and to which *Matthias* is assumed, is by St. *Luke* out of the *Septuagint* called ἐπισκοπὴ *Bishoprick*, *Act.* 1. 20. When accordingly from the *Scripture* usage the *Fathers* of the *Church* have continued the style, *Apostolos* i.e. *Episcopos & Praepositos Dominus elegit, the Lord chose Apostles*, i.e. *Bishops and Governours* of the *Church*, saith * *Cyprian*, *and* ἐν Ῥώμῃ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ Ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, Peter *and* Paul *were the first or chiefe in* Rome, *the same persons, Apostles and Bishops, saith* * Epiphanius, *and Apostoli Episcopi sunt, firmante illud* Petro *Apostolo—the Apostles were Bishops, as is confirmed by* Peter *in these words. His Bishoprick let another take*, saith † *Hilarius Sardus*, and againe, *Are all Apostles? Tis true*, saith hee, *quia in Ecclesiâ unus Episcopus, because in each Church there is one Bishop.* And, *Nemo ignorat Episcopos servatorem Ecclesiis instituisse, Ipse enim priusquam ascenderet, imponens manum Apostolis ordinavit eos Episcopos. No man is ignorant that our Saviour instituted Bishops in the Church, for before he ascended to Heaven hee laid his hands on the Disciples and ordained them Bishops*; saith the * *Writer* of the *questions* on the *Old* and *New Testament*, and, *Sanctus Matthaeus Episcopatum sortitus est, St. Matthew was Bishop*, saith

* *Ep.* 65.

* *L.* 1. *Cont. Carpocr.*

† In *Eph.* 4. & 1 *Cor.* 12. 29.

* *Quæst.* 97.

faith *Gildas*. And to shut up all; φανερὸν δὲ ὅτι οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι—*It is manifest that the Apostles were Bishops, St* John *in* Asia, *St.* Andrew *in* Achaia, *St.* Thomas *in* India; saith * *Gabriel Philadelph*: And agreeably when St. *John* of whom we now speake, calls himselfe in the front of *two Epistles* ὁ Πρεσβύτερος, *the Elder*, the Greek scholiast, resolves ἐπίσκοπον ἑαυτὸν καλεῖ διὰ τῆς πρεσβυτέρου, *by the word Elder he calls himselfe Bishop*. And so there is no newes in thus affirming.

* περὶ τῆς β'. διαφ.

5. But then secondly, when they take this for an *evident demonstration*, that these *Authors* did not use the word *Bishop* in a *Prelaticall* sense, this is very farre distant from a *demonstration*, having not arrived to the loweſt degree of *probability* or *credibility*. For what is a *Bishop* in the *Prelaticall* sense, but a *single* person *governing* in *chiefe* in a *City* or wider circuit? And such certainly was St. *Peter* at *Rome*, S. *John* at *Ephesus*, &c. As long as they continued to execute that *power* of the *Keyes* (the donation of which instituted them οἰκονόμοι *Stewards* in *Gods House*, *Governours* of the *Church*) in this or that *City* or *Region*, and ordained other *Bishops* there.

Thirdly, therefore when 'tis added, that it is certaine that the *Apostles* cannot be properly called *Bishops*, I reply, that it is most certaine they may, not onely because these so many *antient Writers*, through severall ages have called them so, and may not, with any *justice* from us, be accused of *impropriety*, but because the *donation* of the *Keyes* did as properly make them *Bishops*, as the *Commission* to goe *preach* to all Nations, being added to it, made them *Apostles*. To which purpose let these few things be considered, 1. That it is here by the *Assemblies* acknowleged, that the *Apostles* did eminently conteine the *Episcopall Office*, which though it be a little hastily expressed, and should be, I suppose, that the *Apostolicall Office* did *eminently* containe the *Episcopall*, yet there is no doubt, but this is the meaning of it, that the *Apostles* had all the *Episcopall* power in their hands, and over and above, something more, and if they had *Episcopall* power, then sure in respect of that, they may as properly be called

Bi-

Bishops, as in respect of their *Apostolicall Commission*, which they had also, they may be properly called *Apostles*. Thus we know that they that have first the power of *Deacons* bestowed on them, and after of Presbyters, are questionlesse *Deacons* still, though they be also Presbyters, and they which from the *Office* of Presbyters are advanced to *Bishops*, are certainly Presbyters still, though they be also *Bishops*, and doe not lose the *former* power by being advanced to the *latter*, are not *lessened* by this *increase* of their *dignity*.

7. Secondly, that when an *Apostle* is differenced from a *Bishop*, it is either by his extraordinary power granted him for the *planting* of the *Church*, or by the *Universality* of his *Diocese*, the [*all the World*] to which his *Commission* extended, whereas the ordinary *Bishop's* power and *Diocese* are more limited. But then these differences are of no force in this matter, they onely conclude that the *Apostle* is more than a *Bishop* in those two respects, not that in other sufficient respects he is not a *Bishop*.

8. Thirdly, when the *Apostles* had each of them (not onely all together in a *consistory*) that unlimited power, in respect of the *extent* to all the World, given to them by *Christ*, wee know that after his *ascent* they parted and distributed this *Province* among them, assigned every one ἴδιον τόπον, or κλῆρον his *proper place* or *lot*, to which he should betake himselfe for the *planting* of the *faith* of *Christ*; And then there will be no doubt but that hee, who according to his *line* (in St. *Paul's* phrase) had *planted* the *faith* in such a *City* or *Province*, and sat downe, and *confirmed*, and farther *instituted* (which is the meaning of *labouring in the Doctrine*, as well as in the *word*) and *govern'd* them, and exercised all *Episcopall* acts among them, might in so doing be stiled a *Bishop* in that *City* or *province*, and that as truely and as *properly* as he that could doe all the *latter* and not the *former* (building on another mans *foundation*, *governing* and *instructing*, where another had *planted* the *faith* might be said to be.

9. Nay fourthly, we know, that although by *Canons* of the *Church* there is provision made, upon prudentiall *considerations*, that no man shall be made a Bishop *sine titulo*, *without*

a

a title or particular See, to which hee is assigned, yet before those *Canons* forbad it, such *Bishops* there were, and those never doubted to be properly *Bishops*, though they were not affixt to any *Diocese*; And then nothing can hinder but that the *Apostle*, who had each the *whole World* for his *Title*, though hee were never affixed to any particular *Diocese* or *Province*, might be most properly styled a *Bishop* for all that. But this is *ex abundanti*, more than is needfull to our present prætentions of St. *John*, who, we know, was after his returne from *banishment affixt* to *Asia*, and *seated* at *Ephesus* the chiefe *Metropolis* there, to *superintend* in the Jewish part of the *Asian Church* over all the *Bishops* and *Metropolitans* there.

10. To this I might adde fistly, that the *Bishops* in every *City* were *successors* of the Apostles, as is largely *deduced Diss.* 3. c. 3. Sect. 14. &c. which they could not truly be, if the *Apostles*, whom they *succeeded*, were not in vested with that *power*, wherein they *succeeded* them, *i.e.* were not first *Bishops* before them. But I shall not inlarge of this, having no need of more evidences in this matter.

11. Fourthly therefore, when it is added, that if the *Apostles* be affirmed to be properly Bishops, this *were to degrade the* Apostles, *and to make their office ordinary and perpetuall.* This is but a shortnesse of discourse, of which a very few words will suffice to admonish any, for there is no more strength in that *consequence*, than there would be in *affirming* that such an one is a *Man*, therefore he is not a *living Creature*, or that he that saith he is a *living Creature*, degrades him from being a *man*; For as to that of [*ordinary* and *perpetuall*] 'tis no way inconvenient, that the Apostles, who had somewhat *temporary* and *extraordinay* for the *first planting* of Churches (in respect of which especially they were called Apostles) might also have somewhat, which was of *ordinary perpetuall* use in the *Church*, wherein others might and should succeed them, and that is it unquestionably which wee meane by the word Bishops, when we ascribe it to them or any of them, or to *Christ* himselfe, the source and *originall* Copy of that *power* in the *Church*.

12. Fifthly, when another inconvenience is accumulated on this, (much to the former purpose, but in more words) *this were to exalt the* Bishop *above his degree, and make him an* Apostle, *and to make the* Apostle *a* Bishop. 1. It is evident, that if the forementioned *exception* were true, *viz.* That it were the *degrading* the *Apostle*, it could not farther be truly said, that it were the *exalting the* Bishop *above his degree*, for supposing one to be above the other, the *degrading* one would make the other *equall* to him without any *new* act of exalting him: if the *Apostle* have already *descended* to the *Bishop*, sure the *Bishop* need not, cannot *ascend* to the *Apostle*; I cannot goe up staires to him who hath prevented me by his *dignation* or misfortune, and is already *come* or *fallen downe* to me. Secondly therefore this makes not the *Bishop* an *Apostle*, which is a degree higher than he, (though in respect of the *Episcopall* power common to them with the *Apostles* it is nothing strange in the *Antient* Writers for the first *Bishops* of the Churches; *James* the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, *Thaddaus*, *Luke*, *Barnabas*, *Marke*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, to be called *Apostles*, as is evidenced at large in the * *Dissertations*) but onely supposes the *Apostle* to be a *Bishop*, which he may well be (as the *greater* conteineth the *lesse*) though the *Bishop* be no *Apostle*, as it is confest that the *lesse* containes not the *greater*.

* *Diss.* 4. c. 3.

13. And lastly for the citation out of Dr. *Whitaker*, I have no directions to the place, which may inable me to examine it; And I know *circumstances* of the *context*, or the *designe* of the speech may much alter it, from what it signifies to me at my reading it thus cited; But if it be distinctly thus, and incapable of a more *commodious* interpretation, I cannot consent to the truth of it, or comprehend upon what grounds of reason he should so severely censure those *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which have been produced to affirme that the *Apostles* were *Bishops*, and particularly St. *John* and St. *Peter*. And indeed when it falls out, that each of those two *Apostles* peculiarly calls himselfe Πρεσβύτερος an *Elder*, or as they render it *Presbyter*, I shall demand; Did either of those speake *properly* or no? If they did, were either of those *little distant from mad-men*?

mad-men? If so I shall be content to be under any *censure* in their *company*. And therefore if they spake not so *properly*, I shall be content with them to have spoken *improperly* also: But if *Apostles* may be called *Presbyters* without any of these inconveniences of *degradation* in them, any *insolence* in the *Presbyter*, or *madnesse* in the *Speaker*, my onely remaining *Quære* is, why they might not, without all this adoe, be called *Bishops* also, meaning by *Bishops*, as I now meane? For I am sure that is the same thing that I understand by πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* in those *three* places, and they, who differ from me herein, do yet understand it of Presbyters (and so had said in the *second consideration* expressly, that St. *John* calls himselfe a Presbyter) and then all the spice of *madnesse* consists in this, thinking a *Bishop* capable of that *exaltation*, that a Presbyter in perfect *sobriety* is capable of. And so much for the *third consideration*.

Section VI.

Of the word Angel, and Starre, pretended to be common to all Ministers. Of Messenger, and Embassadour. The singularity of the word Angel.

THe *fourth consideration* is, *That the word Angel (which is the title given to those supposed* Bishops*) doth not import any peculiar jurisdiction, or præeminence, but is a common name to all* Ministers, *and so is used in* Scripture. *For all* Ministers *are Gods* Messengers *and* Embassadours *sent for the good of the elect, and therefore the name being common to all* Ministers, *why should we thinke that there should be any thing spoken to one* Minister, *that doth not belong to all? The same may be said of the word* Starre *(which is also a title given to those supposed Metropolitans) It is evident that all faithfull* Ministers *are called* Starres *in Scripture, whose duty is to shine as lights unto the* Churches *in all purity of Doctrine, and holinesse of conversation; There is nothing in these titles that argue these* Ministers *to be* Bishops *in our brethrens sense: Insomuch as had they not been called* Bishops *by some authors that succeeded them, (who spake* Numb. 1.

of former times in the language of their owne times) this way of arguing would have been counted ridiculous.

2. To this *consideration* I might, if it were needfull, reply, 1. That the word *Angel* is no where used for any other *Officer* or *Minister* in the *Church*, save onely the *Prophets* (such as *Haggai*. c. 1. 13. and *John Baptist*, *Mat.* 11. 10.) and the *chiefe Priest*, *Mal.* 2. 7.

3. Secondly, that, as to the words *Messenger*, and *Embassador*, there is in ordinary speech some considerable difference betweene them, the latter having in it a connotation of *dignity*, sustaining the person of the *King*, from whom he is sent *immediately*, which is not applicable to the former; And agreeably when it is used of St. *Paul* and *Timothy*, in whose name that *Epistle* is written [πρεσβεύομεν, wee are *Embassadors*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20.] there is added ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ, *for*, or, *in the name*, and *authority* of *Christ*, and againe *wee pray you* ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ, which we well render, *in Christs stead*, as his *proxies*, for to *Embassadors* are; which being there applied to S. *Paul* an *Apostle*, and to *Timothy*, one imployed by *him* immediatly to *preach* and *plant* the *faith*, and after to *governe* in the *Church*, may by proportion belong to the *Bishops* their successors peculiarly.

4. Thirdly, that as the word Ἄγγελος signifies a *Messenger*, or *Nuntio*, so the word Ἀπόστολος, *Apostle* (according to the *origination* of it from ἀποστέλλεσθαι *to be sent*) signifies also without any considerable difference, but yet is never thought fit, either in *Scripture*, or in the style of the *Church* to be applied to ordinary *Ministers*, but onely to those sent immediately by *Christ*, as he by his *Father* to *plant* and *rule Churches*, and to those who first *succeeded* them, or were imployed by them in that great *office*.

5. But that which wholly frustrates the designe of the *consideration*, is this, that the *singularity* of the *person*, (*one Angel* in each of the seven *Churches*) is all that wee argue from, in this matter; For as to the *power* and *authority* in each *Church*, That is certainly pretended to (and not declin'd) by the *Presbyterian* as well as the *Prelatist*, the onely *Question is*, whether it be placed in *one* over the rest, or in

more

more than one, *ruling* together in *common*, and from the style of *Christs Epistle* to the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus*, and the like in each of the *seven*, wee thinke we conclude regularly, that it was *one*, it being certaine that the *singular* number is not the *duall* or *plurall*, and that [*Angel*] is a *person*, not an *aggregate* body or *multitude*. b

7. And to the same purpose againe wee conclude not from the mention of the *Starres*, not from their *light* or *shining*, but from their *number*, but *seven* in all, no more than there are *Churches*, i.e. *one* onely in each *Church*; And we know there is difference betweene a *Star* and an *Asterisme* or *constellation*, one *single* light, and a *conjunction* of many; And accordingly Mr. *Brightman*, that is resolved not to finde this truth in that *Text*, is forced to deale plainely, and to tell us, that the Epistles are not each of them sent to any *one Angel*, but to the *Colledge of* Pastors, *nec uni alicui Angelo mittuntur, sed toti, ut ita dicam, collegio Pastorum*, in *Apoc.* c. 2. 1. which being sufficiently contrary to the evidence of the *Text*, which reads ἀγγέλῳ *to the Angel*, in the *singular*, he thinkes fit to adde his reason for it; *Non enim unus erat Angelus Ephesi sed plures, nec inter istos aliquis Princeps, for there was not one Angel of* Ephesus, *but many: nor any one among those principall or chiefe*, which is the *begging* of the Question, or proveing his *assertion* onely by *asserting* it; whereas *Beza* finding himselfe more prest by the force of the place, is forced to render it τῷ ἀγγέλῳ, i.e. πρεσβύτῃ, *to the Angel, i.e. to the president, quem nimirum oportuit imprimis de hac rebus admoneri, who was in the first place to be admonished of these things.*

8. What the πρεσβύτης in the use of the *Antient Church* properly signifies, is showne at large out of *Justin Martyr*, *Dionysius Bishop* of *Corinth*, *Marcellus Ancyranus* and the *Councell* of *Ephesus*, *Dissert.* 4. c. 17. directly the same that we meane now by *Bishop*. But that I pretend not to thinke *Beza* meant by it (his *Prolepses* and espoused Principles leading him another way). All that I observe from the *citation*, is, that by the *singularity* of [Ἀγγέλῳ *the Angel*] not *Angels*, he was forced to confesse a single person to be understood,

which is contrary to Mr. *Brightman*, and those that comprehend a *Colledge* of *Presbyters* under the title, which being yeilded, I doubt not but our other evidences already produced (which must not be at every turne repeated) from the *Catalogue* of *Bishops* in the *Church* of *Ephesus*, &c. and the judgement of the *Universal Church* concerning those *single* persons, will conclude them indeed πρεσβυτερους, not in *Beza*'s notion, but in *Justin Martyrs* (who was much a more competent judge) i. e. the *very Bishops* which we pretend them to be: And truly I cannot discerne any weake part (which may hazard being counted *ridiculous*) in this way of *arguing*.

Section VII.

Of their exception to our arguing from Symbols: Of Bishop and Elder being the same.

Num. 1. THe last *Consideration* now remains in these words, *These titles of Stars and Angels are mysterious and metaphoricall, It is said* Rev. 1. 20. *The Mysterie of the seven Stars —— And certainly it cannot be safe or solid to build the structure of Episcopacie by Divine Right upon mysterious and metaphoricall denominations*, Theologia Symbolica non est argumentativa, *Especially if we consider that there are abundance of cleere texts that make Bishops and Presbyters to be one and the same; and it cannot be praise-worthy for any men (though never so learned in the esteem of the world) to oppose certain allegorical and mysterious titles to so many expresse testimonies of Scripture.*

2. To this the *Answer* will be *satisfactory*, though it should be but *briefe*, that we doe not found our argument in an *allegorie*. For 1. though the word *Stars* applyed to the *Governors* of *Churches* be onely *figuratively* so applyed, yet the word ἄγγελος (if the *Authors* of this *consideration* may be believed in that which immediately preceded) signifies (not an *Angel* from *Heaven*, or *incorporeal* substance, but) a *Messenger* or *Embassadour*, such as, say they, all *Ministers* are. And agreeably in that which is here annexed to prove the *allegorical*

gorical or *mystical* phrases (from *Rev.* 1. 20. *the Mistery of the seven Starres*) it is evident, that onely the word [*Starres*] is *Symbolical* or *Mystical*, and as evident that the *Angels* are not, for it is in the explicating and not in the forming of the *figure*, that the *Angels* of the *Churches* are mentioned, as the things which are *signified* by the *mistery* of the *Starres*, as the *Churches* themselves by the *Lamps*; and therefore as it would be absur'd to say that a *symbol* is explicated by a *symbol*, one *mistery* by another, or proportionably that the *Churches*, by which the *Lamps* are expresst, are a *mystical allegorical phrase*, so it will be as unreasonable to affirme of the *Angels*, that they are a *mistery* or *allegorie*, because of the *Starres* it is affirmed that they are such, when indeed the word *Angel* is the interpretation and unfolding of the *mysterie*, which is as far from being the *mistery*, as the *light* is from being *darknesse*, which it expells out of the *horizon*, and is purposely sent by God to doe so.

3. But then *secondly*, 'tis yet more manifest, that if the word *Angel* were here used *figuratively* (as it is evident it was not, and was so confest, when it appeared *usefull* to the *Objectors* that it should not) yet it being the *singularity* of the person, wherein our *argument* is founded, our *argument* is not founded on that which is *mystical*. For certainely this *number* is a plaine *Grammatical* notation of a *singular* person, and that is proofe enough that it was not a *collective* body, a *Presbytery* or *Consistory*, that is meant by it. And in this all the controversie betwixt us and the adversary consists, whether it was in *many* or in *one* in each *Church*, that the *Ecclesiastical* jurisdiction was vested, and that is sufficiently decided by that which is cleare and *unfigurative* in this *Text*, and cannot be imagined otherwise, but by forcing some *figure* on it, by which one *Angel* may be set for more *Ministers*, which if it be done, would not by their rule be *argumentative*.

4. *Thirdly*, Whereas it is suggested, that this which we conclude from hence, is *opposite to many expresse testimonies of Scripture*, I have no more to say in this place, where this is onely

onely *affirmed*, but not attempted to be *proved*, but to professe my perswasion and assurance (the truth of which must be in the processe of this discourse *contested*) that there is no such thing, but on the *contrary*, that the whole *Scripture*, and *practice*, and *writings* of the *first* ages of the *Church*, and the succeeding through all the world, agree directly with what I conclude from the *singularity* of the *Angel*; And when in the following words the *testimonies* are expressed to be those which make *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to be one and the same, This also will immediately vanish, when it is remembred, what is largely deduced in the *Dissertations*, that the word *Bishop* in the *Scripture* is never used for a *Presbyter* in our *Moderne* notion of the word, but constantly for the one *single Governor* in a *Church* or *City*, and that if there be any truth in that which is here affirmed, *Presbyters* must be taken in a notion distant from that in which now we use it, and signifie, as Πρεσβύτερος hath already been said to doe, the *singular Bishop* in each *Church*, and 'tis certaine such an *identity* of the names, will never be deemed contrary to what we have concluded from the *Angel*, but directly confirme it for us.

5. And although here is no occasion in this place to prove and make good this assertion in each part of it, (the first *positivè*, that Ἐπίσκοπος or *Bishop* in *Scripture* alwayes signifies the *singular Bishop*; the second *suppositivè*, that if Ἐπίσκοπος, *Bishop*, and Πρεσβύτερος *Elder*, be *one and the same* in *Scripture*, it must be by interpreting Πρεσβύτερος *Elder*, so as to signifie a *Bishop* in all places) yet 'tis certaine, that this is already done at large in *Dissert.* 4. *cap.* 6. *Sect.* 19, 20, 21, 22. and shall here againe be repeated and vindicated, when the proper place requires it, which I foresee it will speedily doe.

6. In the meane, I must take leave to expresse my present sense, and hope that others will not thinke it too hasty, that no one of these *five Considerations*, nor consequently all of them together, have at all præjudged our *Conclusion* (now in hand) inferred from that of the *Epistle* of *Christ* to the 7. *Angels* of the 7. *Churches*.

Section

Section VIII.

Of the singularity of each Angel. The objections from the use of the plurall number.

THese *considerations* being thus laid as their foundation (and I suppose being already removed from superseding or hindring our *superstructure*) The next part of their method is, having mentioned our objection from the *singularity* of each *Angel*'s person, to whom *Christ*'s *message* or *Epistle* is sent, and the *conclusion* of an *high Prelatist* from hence, that these *Angels* are not onely *Bishops* but *Archbishops*, to apply *solid and every way sufficient answers to this Objection.* Num. 1.

2. In this proposall of our *Objection*, I shall not need to inquire who this *high Prelatist* is; The former intimations and directions have perswaded me that I am lookt on as this *Objector*, though it be sufficiently knowne that the most *Reverend Archbishop* of *Armagh*, *Lord Primate* of *Ireland*, hath many yeares since deduced this *conclusion* in every part from this *Text*, and might, if they had pleased, have secured me from the opinion either of *novelty*, or *singularity* in the *Assertion.*

3. But I shall most willingly assume the burthen, and proceed to the view of the *solid and every way sufficient answers*, which are said to be given to this *Objection*, which though they be, it seemes to be fetcht out of *Smectymnuus*, &c. yet it happens well, that we shall (without need of consulting those larger *volumes*) find them here with more ease, reduced to *two heads*, One, *that the word Angel signifies not a singular person*, the second, *that if it did, it will not at all advantage the Episcopal cause.*

4. These two, I confesse, if either of them be solidly proved, will utterly drive us from our hold: The onely *question* at present is, whether in either part the *proofes* be *solid*, and of this we must now inquire, and first of the *former* of them.

5. This they thus propose, *That the word Angel is not to be taken* ἰδιωτικῶς *but* συλλογικῶς, *not individually, but collectively,*

tively, for all the Pastors and Ministers of the respective Churches.

6. But before their proofes for such an assertion (that the *Angel* of such a *Church*, which is certainly an *individual*, as much as the *Bishop* of such a *Diocese*, is not yet to be taken *individually*) they first adde their *confession* that this answer is *called a poore shift, a vaine conceipt, &c.* but promise such *reasons for the justification of it, which cannot be answered.*

7. To the view of these *unanswerable Reasons* therefore we shall now hasten; And the first *reason* is, because our *Saviour* speakes to the *Angel* often in the *plural* number, *Rev.* 2. 24. *But unto you I say, and the rest of Thyatira*, and so *Rev.* 2. 10. and 13. *By which*, say they, *it is evident, that by the word Angel is not meant one singular person, but the collective body of Rulers.*

8. To this first reason I shall answer, by separating that one text of *Thyatira* from the other two, and all that are of the same nature with them, and speake first of these two, and remind them 1. that in an *Epistle* unquestionably addrest to a *particular person*, others under his care and charge may be, and are *occasionally* mentioned, so in that to *Titus*, *Paul's* owne *Sonne*, i. e. under the particular *character* of the *beloved* person converted by him; in the conclusion we finde these words, *Grace be with you all*, i. e. not with him as he must signifie a whole *Presbyterie*, but all the *sincere lovers* of *Christ*, and Saint *Paul*, *they that love us in the faith*, in the former part of the *verse*.

9. *Secondly*, that though the *one Angel* of the *Church* be the person to whom each part of the *Epistle* is addrest, yet in it are set downe the *sins* and *fate* of the *whole Church*, i. e. of all the *believers* in it; Thus when the people of *Israel* or *Judah* were fallen into foule sins and provocations against *God*, it was ordinary for *God* to send a *Prophet* to the *King* of either of them, and admonish him what *reformations* were to be wrought, and what *judgements* were a comming in case of neglect. In which kind of messages of the *Prophet* delivered to the *King*, 'tis certaine that the whole people were con-

concerned, and so without question was it here, *Rev.*2. 10. the *Devill shall cast some of you*, i. e. some *Members* of that *Church*, *into prison*, &c. and so ver.13. *among you*, i.e. among you of that *Church* or *City*.

10. And indeed if each of those *Churches* had been governed by a *Consistory* of *co-equal Presbyters*, and those (as is pretended by our *adversaries*) signified by the *Angel*, yet there would be as little reason to doubt, but the sins of the people, as well as the *Clergy* were here reprehended by *Christ*, and the judgement threatned to one as well as to the other, And to this can be no reason to inferre the *Angel* to be no *singular* person, the *Church* ruled by *one*, making up a *multitude*, as well as if it were ruled by a *Presbytery*.

11. As for the place, cap.2.24. concerning *Thyatira*, that hath a different appearance, For the *Greek copie* ordinarily reading it [ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω καὶ λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείροις, *But I say unto you* (in the *plural*) *and to the rest which are in Thyatira*] the [*you*] in the *plural*, is by the *Objectors* thought necessarily to belong to the *Angel* of that *City*, as [*the rest*] to the *community* of the people. To this place therefore we have formerly answered, that the reading in the *Antient Manuscripts*, particularly in that belonging to the *Kings Library* at Saint *James's*, leaves out the [καὶ, *and*] and reads thus, ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοίποις, *But to you I say the rest which are in Thyatira*] And this takes away all force from the *objection*, for the former part of the *Epistle* belonging to the *Angel*, who permitted *Jezabel*, and to them that *committed fornication with her*, the [*But*] in the *front* separates the [ὑμῖν λοίποις, *you the rest*] from the *Angel*, and those *other* formerly spoken to, and therefore the ὑμῖν, *you*, cannot possibly be the *Angel*, wherein all the strength of the *Objection* consists.

12. But this Answer, though taken notice of, is disliked: *For*, say they, *he that shall view the Antecedant and Consequent, and consider that* ver. 23. *it is said, I will give to every one of you*, &c. *and then followes, but I say unto you, and then in the conclusion of the verse, I will put upon you no other burthen, will confesse that the old copies are better than that which is said to be* Tecla's *Manuscript*.

13. And here I shall desire the *Reader* to beare me company in obeying their *directions*, and observe what the *Antecedents* and *Consequents* can afford to the prejudice of that *Antient* copy. 'Tis most true, that *v.*23. we read, *I will give to every one of you*, and that then it followes *v.*24. *But I say unto you*, and in the conclusion of the verse, *I will put upon you*—But I demand, what will they conclude from hence? That by the word [*you*] in all these places the *same* persons are to be understood, and that those persons are the *interpretation* of the *Angel* v. 18? These two things they must conclude, or else they will faile in their designe, which is to shew that by the word *Angel* the *collective* body of *Rulers* is meant. But the first of these is evidently false, whatsoever reading be retained, for besides that the [δὲ, *But*] doth clearly separate the second [*you*] from the first, and makes them *distinct* persons, The very matter of the speeches will convince it: For in the 23. *v.* the [*you*] are those that were *corrupted by Iezabel v.*20.22. who are now to be exemplarily *punisht* and *destroyed*, *I will kill her* (i. e. *Iezebels*) *children with death* (as also those that had *committed Fornication with her* v.22.) *and all the Churches shall know that I am the searcher of hearts, and I will give to every of you according to your workes*; But the second [*you*] and so also the *third*, are the *quite* contrary to these, *As many as have not this Doctrine, and who have not knowne these depths of Satan*, and consequently; who are *not* to be *punished*, nor so much as admonished, but onely *confirmed* in their present practice, to *hold fast what they have already*.

14. So contrary is it to all appearance of truth, that the *Antecedent* and *Consequent* should favour their pretension.

15. This matter is so evident (the contrary conditions and fates of the [*you*] in *v.*23 and the [*you*] in *v.*24.) that if the ordinary reading were to be retained [ὑμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς] and that rendred [*to you and the rest in Thyatira*] so as to difference [*you*] and [*the rest*] another *Antecedent* to the *Relative* [*you*] must necessarily be sought out, and then that can be no other but the *Churches* incidentally mentioned

*v.*23.

*v.*23. who had not been charged for this *crime*. For as for the *Angel v.*18. if hee were not so remote (*6. verses* off) and if the *singular* number could be the *Antecedent* to the *plurall* [ὑμῖν, *you*] (as it cannot) yet still he is charged for *suffering the Woman Jezabel*, and so is numbred among the *guilty* persons, that are to *repent* or be *punisht*, and not to have *no other burthen laid on them, save only to hold fast what they have*, as is said of the second [ὑμῖν *you*] *v.*24.

16. But the truth is, that of making the *Churches* the *Relative* is so inconvenient (and yet no other way imaginable to reconcile the *ordinary* reading) and the whole sense is so much more *cleare* and current in the reading of the *King's* MS. [*But to you the rest in Thyatira* (those that had not beene guilty of the misbehaviours censured, and threatned in the former Verses) that I professe I cannot discerne any appearance of reason to *question* the truth of it, much lesse to *conceive* that the *ordinary* copies are better, which yet however they read it, must oppose the [ὑμῖν *you*] to those before mentioned, and so cannot apply it with any appearance of probability to the *Angel*, or consequently prejudge *ours*, or confirme *their* pretensions.

Section IX.

Of the Elders at Ephesus *Act.*20.

A Second *reason* to prove the *Angel* to be a *collective* body, is this, because *it is certaine that the Church of* Ephesus *was a collective body, and that there were many* Presbyters *to whom St.* Paul, *at his finall departure from them, committed the charge of that Church. And these* Presbyters *are called* Bishops, *and were all of them* Stars *of the same magnitude, and* Angels *of the same order without a difference or distinction.* Numb. 1.

2. But this is a way of proving a thing which is *denyed*, by another which they know is equally *denyed* by him, against whom they dispute, and therefore that *argument* can be of no force with us.

3. 'Tis most true indeed, what they begin with, that the *Church* of *Ephesus* was a *collective* body, for so 'tis certaine every *Church* is, whether governed by one or more *Rulers*; But the *Church* is not the *Angel*, any more than the *candlesticks* are the *Stars*, but punctually distinguished from them *Rev.*1.20. But this I suppose was a mistake hastily fallen from them, and I shall not pursue it any farther.

4. Their argument, I conceive, depends upon the *plurality* of *Elders* [πρεσβύτεροι] which were at *Ephesus* Act.20. when *Paul* takes his leave of them, and calls them *Bishops*. But to this they know I have answered clearly, that as in other places of *Scripture*, so in that, the word πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, being all one with Ἐπίσκοποι, *Bishops*, denote (not the many *Presbyters* of the *one* City of *Ephesus*, but) the many *Bishops* of that and other Cities of *Asia*, which at that time by S. *Paul's* summons sent to *Ephesus*, the chiefe *Metropolis* of *Asia*, were called and met together at *Miletus*.

* *L.3.c.14.* 5. To this purpose * *Irenæus* is a witnesse beyond exception, who speaking of these *Elders* or *Bishops*, addes, *ab Epheso & proximis civitatibus convocatos esse*, *that they were assembled from* Ephesus *and the next Cities*, in which as the *faith* was planted, as well as in *Ephesus* (even in all *Asia*) so there is no reason to doubt but there were *Bishops* in them, as well as in *Ephesus* (seven such *Churches* we know are here mentioned in the *Revelation*) and that *Paul* was as carefull to take his leave of them (as many as could conveniently come to *Miletus* in his hasty progresse) as of the *Bishop* of *Ephesus* hee is justly deemed to have been.

6. Other *arguments* and *authorities* I need not here accumulate for this notion of *Elders* Act. 20. because here is no appearance of reason offered to prove their, or impugne our *Assertion*. This perhaps will be afterward attempted, and then I shall, as occasion requires, farther enlarge: In the meane it sufficeth that it yet no way appeares, that *Ephesus* was governed by *many Presbyters*, and not by *one Bishop*, and therefore this second offer of *reason* is as deficient as the first, to prove the *Angel* of that *Church* to have been a *collective* body.

Section

Section X.

Of expressing a number by singulars. A Church by a Candlestick. Of the seven Angels *Rev.* 8.

THeir *third reason is*, because *It is usuall with the Holy Ghost, not onely in other Bookes of Scripture, but in this very Booke of the Revelation, in mysterious and prophetick writings, and visionall representations (such as this of the* Starres *and Golden Candlestick is) to expresse a number of things or persons in singulars. And this in visions is the usuall way of Representation of things, a thousand persons making up one Church is represented by one Candlestick, many* Ministers *making up one* Presbytery *by one* Angel. *Thus* Rev. 8.2. *It is said that* John *saw seven* Angels *which stood before God. By these seven Candlesticks* (I suppose it should be *seven* Angels) *Dr.* Reynolds *doth not understand seven individuall* Angels, *but all the* Angels; *For there are no seven individuall* Angels *that stand before God, but all doe,* Dan 7. *there are many more instances brought in the Bookes forementioned.* Num. 1.

2. To this *third Reason* I have no obligation or notice to give credit, any farther than the *evidences* perswade, for many of which, though we are referred to *Smectymnuus*, &c. yet having received promise from these, that they would borrow a *few things* from those others; I shall with reason hope that what they have upon *choise borrowed*, *leaving*, as they say, *much more behind*, is the most *satisfactory* and *solid* of any thing by them produced; and consequently if there be no force in these instances to oppugne our *conclusion*, we shall not expect to finde more *convincing* ones by travailing farther, and gathering up out of those *dispersions*, what they have refused to take up and offer to us.

3. The thing they would prove is, that *'tis usuall with the Holy Ghost in this* (*as in other mysterious prophetick Bookes*) *to expresse a number of things or persons by singulars.* Their proofes are but three, and the first is of no force, because the word *Church* denotes a *singular* thing, as well as *Candlestick* that represents it; for though a *thousand* men make up one

Church,

Church, yet *one Church* is but *one* thing, considered as a *Church*, and proportionably as *one Candlestick* in the *singular* is set to denote each *Church*, so there are *seven Candlesticks* to represent the *seven Churches*.

4. As for the second, that of the *Angels*, that that signifies *many Ministers*, that cannot be offered as a *proofe*, being it selfe the matter of the *question*. And indeed though *Church* be a *collective* body, and so one *Church* is knowne to consist of *many men*, yet *Angel* is not of that nature, *one Angel* neither signifies *many* men, nor *many Angels*.

5. And whereas the *parallel* is set betwixt the word *Candlestick*, and the word *Angel*, that they (each) are *singular* words, by which *multitudes* are represented, that is a mistake, for the *parallel* lyes betwixt *Church* and *Angel* (and on the other side betwixt *Candlestick* and *Starre*, as appeares *Rev.* 1.20.) and both these are *individual* things, the *Church* an *individual Church*, and there be seven such *individual Churches*, and the *Angel* an *individual Angel*, and there be seven such *individual Angels*, and there can be no more pretense that one *Angel* should signifie *many Ministers*, than that one *Church* should signifie *many Congregations*.

6. Lastly, for the third proofe, that of seven *Angels*, *Rev.* 8.2. if that were granted to Doctor *Reynold's* authority, that the [*seven Angels*] there signifies *all the Angels*, yet would it not at all contribute to the proofe of the point in hand, which is, that *many* shall be signified by a *singular*, for we know that *seven* are not a *singular*, but the custome indeed being ordinary to use a *certaine definite* number, for an *uncertaine* or *indefinite*, and the *septenary* being a *perfect* number, and so fittest for the turne, 'tis more tolerable that the number of *seven* may represent some greater number, one *plural* a larger *plural*, than that a *singular* one should doe so.

7. And yet secondly, there is no great reason to doubt, but that the *seven Angels* are indeed very *seven Angels*, and no more; This I collect, 1. from the *seven Trumpets* that were given them, *ver.* 2. and the specifying them by that *Character*, *the seven Angels*, *which had the seven Trumpets*, ver. 6. *Secondly*, by the severall employments assigned them in the sub-

ſubſequent parts of the *viſion* which brings them upon the *ſcene* one after another, the *firſt Angel*, ver. 7. the *ſecond Angel*, ver. 8. and ſo to the *ſeventh*. Thirdly, by the diſtinction that is evidently made between theſe *ſeven Angels* and *another Angel*, ver. 3. *And another came and ſtood at the Altar*: which makes it certaine that the former *ſeven* did not ſignifie *all the Angels*, unleſſe after *all*, there could yet be *one* more. Fourthly, from the mention of the *ſeven Spirits*, cap. 1. 4. which are ſaid to be *before Gods throne*, that ſure is all one with *ſtanding before* him here, and it being certaine that *Angels* are *Spirits*, I have no reaſon to doubt but that theſe *ſeven Angels* are thoſe *ſeven ſpirits*, and ſo ſtill a *definite* number of *ſeven*, and no more. Fifthly, from the mention of the *ſeven Eyes*, *Zach.* 4. 10. which ſeeme to be interpreted to this ſence, *Rev.* 5. 6. *ſeven eyes which are the ſeven Spirits of God ſent into all the Land.*

8. And though in ſome of theſe places other men have had other notions, yet λοιμότερον τὰς ἀγγέλους ταῦτα νοεῖν, *'tis more to be approved that we underſtood Angels by that phraſe*, cap. 1. ſaith *Andreas Cæſarienſis*, And of the whole matter, Ἑπτὰ μέν εἰσιν οἱ τῷ μεγίστῳ δυνάμει ἔχοντες, πρωτόγονοι Ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες, *there are ſeven which have the greateſt power, the firſt borne Princes of the Angels*, ſaith *Clemens Alexandrinus*. In which words of his, the *firſt borne Princes* are evidently taken from *Dan.* 10. 13. where the *Hebrew* reads שרים הראשנים *the Principal* or *firſt rulers* or *Princes*, of which *Michael* is the *firſt*, and thence called *Archangel*. *Strom.* 6.

9. And ſo in *Tobit*, cap. 12. 15. we find *ſeven holy Angels which preſent the prayers of the Saints*, which deſcription of them and their *office*, to *preſent the prayers of the Saints*, if it be thought unagreeable to their *ſtanding* here *before God* or being *before his throne*, it will ſoone be reconciled by that ſpeech of *Chriſt*, that the *Angels* of the *infant* tender *Chriſtians alwayes behold the face of God*, and by that meanes are qualified to make their wants knowne unto him, which is all one with *preſenting* of *prayers*.

10. *Sixthly*, from the mention of the *ſeven Lamps*, *Rev.* 4. 5.

(styled *Lamps*, in reference to the like number of *Lamps* on the *Candlestick* in the *Sanctuary*) which *burne before the throne*, as cap. 1. they *are before the throne*, For of these it is added αἱ εἰσι τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ, *which are the seven* (by way of eminencie, or the *seven Principal*) *spirits of God.*

11. *Seventhly*, from the no appearance of the least reason produced to the contrary; For as to that which is introduced with a [*For*] and supplyes the place of a *reason*, it is evidently a bare *assertion* of the contrary, [*there are no seven individual Angels that stand before God*] without any offer of proofe, that *testimony* out of *Dan.* 7. that *all* doe, being far from concluding that there are not such *seven principal Angels* which these so many evidences assure us there are.

12. In that of *Dan.* 7. 10. upon that solemne occasion of *God's judgements* expresst by a *fiery streame*, *thousand thousands* are said to *Minister to him*, and *ten thousand times ten thousand* to *stand before him*. But how doth that hinder but at another time, *seven principal Angels* may be employed by him, and in order to that *stand before him* too, and when we so oft reade of such *seven*, what question but they were *individual Angels*? And so much for the *third reason.*

Section XI.

Of the Epistles being sent to the whole Church, not to the Bishop onely. Of Timothy, Onesimus *and* Polycarp, *being Bishops of some of the* Asian *Churches, without any charge of Apostacy falling on them by this meanes.*

Numb. 1. THere is a *fourth* behinde still, *that though but one Angel be mentioned in the fore-front, yet it is evident that the Epistles themselves* (*though we are farre from thinking that in formal denomination, the Angels and the Candlesticks are the same*) *are dedicated to all the Angels and Ministers in the Church, and to the Churches themselves, as appeares* Rev. 1. 10. Rev. 2. 7. 11. 17. *And therefore when it is said in the singular number, I know thy workes, This thou hast, Repent and doe thy first workes, &c. All*

these

theſe and the like places are not to be underſtood as meant of one individual perſon, but of the whole company of Miniſters, and alſo of the whole Church, becauſe the puniſhment threatned is to the whole Church, Rev.2.5.16.2. Now we have no warrant in the Word to thinke that Chriſt would remove his Goſpell from a Church for the ſin of one Biſhop, when all the other miniſters and Churches are farre from thoſe ſins.

2. To this I ſhall need make no reply, having done it ſufficiently already, by conceſſion that the *Angel* being the *Ruler* of a *Church*, the whole *Epiſtle* belongs to him and the *Church* promiſcuouſly, and agreeably thoſe expreſſions, which are uſed in the *ſingular* number, doe not all belong to the *Biſhop*, but to the *Church* wherein he *præſides*: But certainly this is farre from inferring that the *Biſhop* and *Church* are all one, or that the word *Angel* ſignifies the *collective* body of the *Church*, for, beſides that the *Text* is expreſſe in making a ſignall difference between the *Starres* and the *Candleſticks*, the *Angels* and the *Churches* (and the *Aſſemblers* are here forced to confeſſe that the *Angels* and *Candleſticks* are not the ſame) the confounding them will be as diſadvantageous to them as to us, and I ſhall as regularly be able to conclude that the word *Angel* ſignifies not the *Preſbytery*, but the whole *diffuſive* body of the *Church*, as they can pretend to doe upon their owne *poſtulatum*, that the *Angel* denotes not the *Biſhop* but the whole *Church*, it being as certaine that they make a difference between the *Church* or multitude of *believers*, and the *Preſbytery* that is ſet over them to *rule*, as we doe between the ſame *Church* and the *Biſhop*.

3. Thus have we viewed all the reaſons produced by them to aſſert or confirme their firſt *anſwer*, and ſhewed divers wayes how no manner of validity there is in any one or all of them, to evidence it to be a *ſolid and every way ſufficient anſwer*. And therefore there was ſome uſe of the next part of the Method, to call in the *authority* of other men to countenance this *interpretation*, Maſter *Brightman*, Maſter *Perkins*, Maſter *Foxe*, (who citeth *Primaſius Haymo*, *Beda*, *Richardus*, *Thomas*, &c.) Doctor *Fulke*, Maſter *Meade*, *Gregory* and Saint *Auſtin*; But although they have thought fit to

set downe these names, yet having omitted to adde their *Testimonies*, and indeed having resolved to forbear, because *Smectymnuus* hath done it already, I shall confesse my selfe willing to leave this *chase*, and in stead of leading the Reader so wearisome a walke, to examine the severall *comments* here named (and but named) give him more shortly my *conjecture* what truth may be in them.

4. Master *Brightman*, I know (and some others 'tis possible) may have interpreted the *Angel* to signifie the *whole College* of *Pastors*, and truly I should much sooner take up an *Interpretation* upon the bare word of these *Assemblers*, than I would upon no better evidence from M. *Brightman*; He was *one learned* man, long knowne to be unkinde to our *Prelates*, and here are many, for ought I know, as *learned*, though under the same *præjudices*.

5. Some others here cited, I cannot believe are brought to testifie this, but onely that what is said to the *Angel* in each part of the *Epistle*, was said to the *whole Church*, and not onely to the *Bishop*; and if that be all they say, it is that which we cannot doubt to affirme with them, and have oft confest to understand *Christ's Epistle* so, without any incommodity to our prætensions.

6. If I mistake in these *conjectures*, I desire pardon, and shall hope to give a better account, when I reade the *testimonies* in the *Authors* from whence they are cited. For in these *derivations* of *testimonies*, the *Assemblers* citing them from *Smectymnuus*, *Smectymnuus* from Master *Foxe*, Master *Foxe* from *Primasius*, &c. there is great possibility of mistake, and therefore I shall follow the example before me, *forbeare* adding any more of this matter.

7. In the next place they are pleased to take notice as of an *objection* against their *interpretation*, that *some Authors say*, Timothy *was Bishop of* Ephesus *when our Saviour wrote this Epistle*, *others that* Onesimus *was Bishop*, *others that* Polycarp *was Bishop of* Smyrna *at that time*, *and therefore these Angels must needs be taken individually for so many single persons*.

8. Of this *Objection*, which they have thus formed for us, there-

there is onely thus much of truth, that out of *authentique Records* we bring undeniable evidences for *Timothies* being constituted by St. *Paul* Bishop of *Ephesus*, for *Onesimus* being placed in that *See* at the time of *Ignatius*'s writing to the *Ephesians*, that *Polycarpe* was constituted *Bishop* of *Smyrna* by S. *John*, of all which we have spoken enough already.

9. But of all or any of these being *Bishops* in those *Cities* at the very time of *Christ's* addressing this *Epistle* to the *Angels* of each, this had no where been our affirmation, nor would it have beene usefull to us in any considerable degree, if we had grounds positively to affirme it. All that is needfull to us is this, that by the *Antient* Records, which evidence them to have been so early *Bishops* in two of those *Churches*, to which *Christ's Epistle* was sent, and *Bishops* in the notion wherein we now use the word, we are secured of the truth of our *collections*, when from the mention of the *seven Angels* of the 7. *Churches*, we assert the *Ecclesiasticall* power in the hands of a *single Bishop* in each *Church* to be owned and confirmed by *Christ*; And supposing some other persons, and none of these three to have beene those very *numericall Angels* to whom those *Epistles* were written, this *conclusion* of ours stands yet as firme, as if we could *demonstrate* it of those very *numericall* persons, there being no reason to doubt but the same manner of *Government* continued all the *Scripture* times; and to *Timothies successour* and *Onesimus's predecessor*, being as certainly *Bishops*, as either *Onesimus* or *Timothy* himselfe; when withall we have already produced mentions from the *Antients* of the *Catalogues* of those *Bishops* which succeeded *Timothy* in that *See*.

10. Having thus set right the *Objection* for them, so as it is owned by us to be an *Objection* against them, it will now soone appeare what force there is in their *answers* to it, and those are three.

11. Firſt, *that they that say that* Timothy *was then Bishop, offer no little injury to him, for they thereby charge him to be guilty of Apostacy, and of losing his first love, and so out of a blind zeale to Episcopacy they make that glorious Saint to stand charged as an Apostate. The like injury is offered by Objections to* Onesimus.

12. But first you see whatever our *opinion* is exprest to be we have not *affirmed* either of these, as to the *person* either of *Timothy* or *Onesimus*, but left it uncertaine who the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus* was, whether either or neither of these, but some *successor* of the one, and *predecessor* of the other, and so what charge soever falls on that *Angel*, it falls not necessarily on *either* of these.

13. Secondly it is already agreed betwixt the parties, affirmed by them, and acknowledged by me, that the *Epistle* being addrest to the *Angel* of *Ephesus*, the *Church* or *diffusive* body, the *Christians* in it, were concerned in the *contents* of it; And then whatsoever charge be found in the *Epistle*, of how heavy a nature soever, even of *Apostacy* it selfe, yet there is no necessity the *Angel* or *Bishop* should be *personally* guilty of it, and so whosoever the *Bishop* was, though *Timothy* himselfe, our *zeale* to *Episcopacy* hath not beene so *blind* or transporting, as to put us on any *uncharitable censure*, to affix any *unhandsome* character upon so *glorious* a *Saint*.

14. Lastly, to remove this answer yet one degree farther from being satisfactory, it no where appeares that *Apostacy* is in that *Epistle* laid to the charge, whether of the *Church* or *Angel*; The first part is all in *commendation* of their *former zeal*, and the later, wherein their charge consists, *v.* 4. is only this [ἀγάπην σοῦ τὴν πρώτην ἀφῆκας] which is not (as is suggested) *losing* their *first love*, but *remitting* it; Their *love* to *Christ* had formerly been *strong as death*, pure and vehement, such as had *cast out* all *feare* of dangers, and evidenced it selfe in couragious *confession*, but now, though it were not quite lost, yet it was remitted, lessened in the degree, not so *intense* as formerly, and therefore when they are bid *remember from whence* they *are fallen*, that *fall* doth not necessarily signifie *Apostacy* or *renouncing* of *Christianity* (for then it had been an impertinent *threatning* to *remove* their *Chandlestick* *v.* 5.) but a *falling* from the former degree, a *cooling* of the *intense heat*, which had been so laudable in them. And so still there is more invalidity in this first *answer*.

Section

Section XII.

Of Timothies *being an Evangelist, that it hinders not his being a Bishop.*

THe *second* is, that they *have already proved that* Timothy *was an Evangelist in a proper sense, and therefore cannot be called Bishop of* Ephesus *in their sense.* Num. 1.

2. To this I reply, 1. That *Timothies* being an *Evangelist* no way prejudgeth his being a *Bishop* in our sense, An *Evangelist* is one commissionated by any of the *Apostles'* Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι to *preach the Gospell* to any *City* or *People*; And a *Bishop* is one *commissionated* by the like *Apostle* to *præside* in, and *governe* a *Church* already planted. And what hinders but that he that hath beene employed in the former capacity to *plant*, may elsewhere or in the same place be appointed to *Governe*, and so the *Evangelist* be a *Bishop*?

3. Whatsoever *Objections* can be brought against this, I shall not doubt will be easily *answered*, but there is no offer of any here, and therefore it will not be pertinent farther to treat it in this place.

4. Secondly, it must againe be remembred, that what is here said of *Timothy* is proper to his *person*, both from *Onesimus* and *Polycarpe*, and all other *Angels*, whether succeeding *Timothy* in *Ephesus*, or *præsiding* in the other 7. *Asian Churches*, and therefore though *Timothy* by being an Evangelist were rendred uncapable (which yet he was not) of being the *Bishop* of *Ephesus* in our sense, yet those other *seven Angels* at the very time of the writing this *Epistle* of which none have been proved to be Evangelists, may still be *Bishops* in our sense.

5. Thirdly, I shall demand upon the *Assemblers* principles, who allow a *Primus Presbyter*, a *Prolocutor* in their *consistory* or *Councell* of *Presbyters*, might *Timothy* be that *first Presbyter* in the *Church* of *Ephesus*, or did his being an *Evangelist* hinder him from being so, when he was by St. *Paul* exhorted or appointed μεμεῖναι *to abide* in that *City*? I cannot imagine they will say he could not, who give both St. *Peter* and

St.

St *John* leave to call themselves *Presbyters*; But if he could in their opinion, then why might he not be a *Bishop* in our sense (notwithstanding that he was an *Evangelist*) as well as a *Presbyter* in theirs? I foresee not what answer can be adapted to this *Dilemma*.

Section XIII.

Of the Bishops *at* Ephesus. *Of the plurall number in the Epistle to the* Angel *of* Smyrna.

Num. 1. THere remaines a *third* branch of the *Answer*, that *it will not follow because* Onesimus *was Bishop of* Ephesus *in St.* John's *dayes, that therefore he was the onely person to whom Christ wrote his Epistle; For St.* Paul *tells us there were many Bishops at* Ephesus *(besides the supposed* Onesimus*) and Christ may very well write to him, and to all the rest as well as him. The like may be said concerning* Polycarpe, *for our Saviour speakes to the* Angel *of the Church of* Smyrna *in the plurall number,* Rev. 2. 10. *And therefore hee may truly be said to write to all the other* Angels *that were at* Smyrna, *as well as to one.*

2. Here is nothing in this branch but what hath beene distinctly forestall'd, and spoken to largely already, it will suffice that we repeat the heads, and leave the Reader to view the places, where they are more explicitly handled. And 1. though St. *Paul* should tell us that there were *many Bishops* at *Ephesus*, as there might be from other *Cities* occasionally met there, yet it would not follow that there were more than one *Bishop* of that *City*, or consequently that *Christ* in a peculiar addresse to the *Angel* of that *City* could write to more *Bishops* there.

3. But then secondly, the whole truth is this, that S. *Luke* (and not St *Paul*) tells, that upon St. *Pauls* summons sent to *Ephesus*, many *Bishops* met him at *Miletus*; *Ephesus* being the chiefe *Metropolis* was the fittest meanes to convey the *summons* to the Cities neer it, and from *them* and not onely from

from them, and not onely from *Ephesus* came the *Bishops* to him, as hath been declared out of *Irenaeus*.

4. Thirdly, for our *Saviour's* speaking to the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna* in the *plurall* number, that is not punctually true, for though the letter be written and inscribed to the *Angel*, yet, as hath oft been said, the *whole Church* is concerned in the contents of it, and so speaking to the *Angel* in the *singular*, he may yet speake to the *Church* or any members thereof, in the *plurall* number. And so much againe to demonstrate the ineffectualnesse of the first Head of Answers.

Section XIV.

Of Beza's *Interpretation, of the Præsident.*

THe *second* followes upon a *supposition* (but not *grant*) *that these* Angels *were persona singulares, and that the word* Angel *is to be taken individually, yet they conceive this will not at all advantage the Episcopall cause. For* 1. *Mr.* Beza *(no great friend to Episcopacy) acknowledgeth that by these words* to the Angel *is meant* τῷ προεστῶτι *to the Præsident, as whom it behooved specially to be admonished touching those matters, and by him both the rest of his Collegues, and the whole Church likewise; but then he addeth, But that Episcopal degree which was afterward by humane invention brought into the Church of God, certainly neither can nor ought to be from hence concluded. Nay, not so much as the Office of a perpetuall President should be of necessity as the thence arising Oligarchical tyranny (whose head is the Antichristian beast) now at length with the most certaine ruine, not of the Church onely, but of the word also, maketh manifest; By which quotation it is evident, that though* Beza *held the* Angel *to be a singular person, yet he held him to be* Angelus Præses, *not* Angelus Princeps; *and that he was* Præses pro tempore, *just as a Moderator in an Assembly, or as a Speaker in Parliament.* Numb. 1.

2. To this I reply, 1. that Mr. *Beza's* interpretation, as it was foreknown and formerly mentioned by us, so was it

not in reason to be of any force or *authority* with us, if it be but upon the score intimated here, that he was not onely *no great friend*, but a knowne *professt enemy* of *Episcopacy*, and so was obliged to be, by the course wherein he was engaged at *Geneva*. All that his authority concludes, is, that to avoid a plaine testimony, which is not for his turne, a man may be induced to affirme that *confidently*, for which he hath no ground of proofe, nay, wherein all wayes of *evidence*, that the matter is capable of, are *absolutely* against him.

3. Thus 'tis certainly in this matter, for when *Beza* hath here acknowledged that the *Angel* was the πρῶτος *President*, who will be the most competent *Judge* or *Witnesse*, to determine what was meant by the πρῶτος *Præsident*] in the *Primitive Church*, what kind of *Præsidency* he had, whether onely of *place* or *order*, and that onely for a *time*, or of *superiority* of *power* and *office*, and that *perpetuall*? In all reason this is to be fetcht from those first Writers which speake of it, and either use the very word πρῶτος *President*, for such a *Bishop*, as we now assert (a *singular* person in every *Church*, having a power for life over all the *Officers* and Members of the *Church*, and succeeding some *Apostle*, or *Apostolicall* person in that *power*) or else in other words affirme the same thing.

* *Dissert.* 4. 4. Of this store of evidences are * elsewhere produced, in the explication of the severall titles, by which this *singular præfect* was antiently knowne, whether of *Apostle*, in a *secondary* use of that word, of *Angel*, of *Bishop*, of *Elder*, of *Ruler*, of *Pastor*, of *Doctor*, of *Steward*, of *President*, of *Priest*; Against which the bare authority of Mr. *Beza's* name, who hath fancied a temporary *President* or *Prolocutor*, and brought no manner of reason to confirme it, will have very little validity in it.

5. What is proved by the bare *testimony* of *Beza*, is farther confirmed by a like citation out of the *Reverend Divines at the Isle of* Wight, *who by the example of the King sending a message to both Houses, and directing it To the Speaker of the House of Peeres, which inferres not that either the Speaker is always the same person, or the Governour, or Ruler of the two Houses.*

Houses in the least, conclude, that notwithstanding this direction of Christ's Epistle to the Angels, *yet they might be neither* Bishops, *nor yet perpetuall Moderators.*

6. But the authority of those *Divines*, which had this answer from *Beza*, addes nothing of *weight*, because nothing of *proofe* to it; As for their *similitude*, it concludes nothing but this, that these *Divines* thought fit to make use of this instance of a *Speaker* in *Parliament*, to shew the thing *possible* to have been, not to prove that so it *was*, And the matter of our present inquiry, is not, what a kinde of *president Christ* and his *Apostles* might, if they would, have left in each *Church*, but what really they did; And that must be contested by the best *Records* of those times, not by a *similitude* of a *Speaker* in our *Parliaments*. And that is all I needs to say to that *Section*.

Section XV.

Of Dr. Reynolds *interpretation, of the Bishop in* Cyprian. *Of Ordination by Bishops not without Presbyters, from the Testimonies of* Cyprian, *and* Fermilian.

AFter the *authority* of Mr. *Beza*, backt with that of the *Divines* at the *Isle of Wight*, is added, in the *second* place, the *authority* of Dr. *Reynolds*, who as he hath a *Letter in print against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, so he acknowledgeth also in his conference with* Hart, Dial. 3. *That this* Angel *was* persona singularis: *For he saith,* Numb. 1.

2. The whole place of Dr. *Reynolds* is set down at large by the *Archbishop* of *Armagh* in the front of his *learned Dissertation* of the *Originall* of *Bishops* and *Metropolitanes*, and I shall not neede here to recite it, being of some *length*, and indeed nothing in it defined or expresst of his opinion, that the *President*, when he was made such, either continued to be *equall* with the rest of the *Presbyters*, or lasted but for a *time*, so as the *Prolocutor* of an *Assembly* doth; I am sure he affirms him to have had the *Presidentship* (not among, but) *over Elders* (which I suppose must imply some *power*) and that

this was he that in the *Primitive Church* the *Fathers* called *Bishop*, and applies to him the mentions of *Bishops* made by St. *Cyprian* (and *Cornelius*) of whose notion of *Bishops*, that it belongs not to a bare *Prolocutor* of an *Assembly*, nay, that in nothing it differeth from ours, I am sufficiently assured, and so will the *Reader* by what is cited from him *Dissert.* 3. c. 3. §. 13. And because from some other *intimations* in this *Book* **Append.* p. 229 I see there is neede of it, I shall here πρὸς δέξιν out of many, mention this one *evidence* more.

3. In the 60 *Epistle* to *Rogatian* a *Bishop*, who had beene wronged and *contumeliously* used by a *Deacon* of his *Church*, and had written an account of it to *Cyprian* and the * *annuall Councell* of *Bishops* with him, *Cyprian* returnes this Answer, that it was his *humility* to make this *complaint* to the *councell*, Cum pro Episcopatus vigore, & Cathedræ authoritate haberes potestatem, quâ possis de illo statim vindicari, *when by force of his Episcopall power, and by authority of his chaire, hee had power himselfe to inflict punishment on him immediatly*, and that *punishment* afterward specified, *ut eum deponas vel abstineas, either to depose him or suspend him.*

Ego & Collega mei qui præsentes aderant.

4. Here it was a part of *Rogatian's Episcopall power*, without any *joyning* with him, to *judge* and *censure* the *inferiour Officers* of the *Church*, and they were bound *honorem sacerdotis agnoscere & Episcopo præposito suo*—as it followes in that *Epistle*, *to acknowledge the honour of their Priest, and with full humility make satisfaction to the Bishop which is set over them.* All *power* in the hands of *one* set over all, call'd *promiscuously Priest* and *Bishop* in *Cyprian's* style.

5. And therefore when in the *Appendix* to this Book, these men to prove that *Ordination by Bishops without the assistance of* Presbyters *was alwayes forbidden and opposed*, tell us of *Aurelius's* being ordained by *Cyprian*, and his *Collegues*, Ep. 33. and then assure us from *Ep.* 58. that by his *collegues* he meanes his *Presbyters* (where yet there is no other proofe of it; but the using of these *words* in the *Inscription* of the *Epistle*, Cyprianus *cum Collegis*, and *Ego & collega*, Cyprian *with his collegues*; and *I and my collegues*) This is a great, but discernible *fallacy* put upon the *Reader*, as will soone appeare

1. If

1. If we but observe that the 33 *Epistle*, where he tells of *Aurelius*, was written by *Cyprian* to his *Presbyters*, and so they are the persons whom he advertiseth, what *he and his Collegues* had done, and so sure were not those *Collegues* that did it *with* him. Or secondly, if for the understanding *Cyprian's* notion of *Collegues*, *Ep.* 58. we shall but looke forward to the next *Epistle* 59. for that will fully discover it, being this, *Cyprianus & cæteri Collegæ qui in Concilio affuerunt numero LXVI.* where *Cyprians Collegues* are evidently the 66. *Bishops* that were in *Councel* with him.

6. The like might be also observed of the *Testimony* out of *Firmilian*, which they there subjoyne, of the *Seniores* and *Præpositi* that have *power* of *ordeining*, by whom, say they, *the Presbyters as well as the Bishops are understood*; But againe 'tis cleare by the expresse words of the *Epistle*, that by them are meant the *Bishops* in their *annual Councel*, *Necessario apud nos fit ut per singulos annos Seniores & Præpositi in unum conveniamus* —— *'T is necessary that every yeare we the Elders and Governors should meet together to dispose and order those things which are committed to our care*, adding concerning the *Church* (in opposition to *Hereticks*) *that all power and grace is placed in it, ubi præsident majores natu, qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi & ordinandi possident potestatem, wherein the Elders praside, and have power of Baptizing, absolving and ordeining*, an evident *description* of the *Bishops*. But this by the way, as an essay, what their *testimonies* out of the *Fathers*, scattered sometimes in this Book, would be found to be, if this were a place to *examine* them.

7. Lastly Dr. *Reinolds* acknowledges another *Præsident* even among *Bishops*, the *Bishop* of the *chiefest* City in the *Province*, and so a *Metropolitan*. All which are contrary enough to the prætensions of the *Presbyterians* (what amends he hath made them in his *Printed letter* I know not:)

8. Yet after all this, there lyes no obligation upon us to regulate our *Doctrine* by Doctor *Reinolds's* scheme in this matter, being sufficiently instructed by the *Primitive* records and practice, what kind of *power* and *dignity* belonged to the *Heresiarch* or *Præsident* among them, the very same that we now

pretend to be the *Bishops* due, And if *Christ's* letter were addrest to the *Angel*, as to such a Πρόεδρος or *Praesident*, 'tis all that we desire, to erect our fabrick of *Episcopacy* on this one place, if there were not (as there are) others able to support the weight of it.

9. And so we see what reasons have been brought to make good their *second* head of *Answers*, of which we had promise that they were *solid and every way sufficient answers*, and yet in the issue there is nothing so much as offered toward it, save onely the *testimony* of Master *Beza*, the *Divines* at the *Isle* of *Wight* (which is by interpretation themselves) and Doctor *Reynolds*, who yet is not perfectly of their party neither.

Section XVI.

Of the Churches of Asia *being Metropolitical. Of the paucity of believers.*

Num. 1. HAving thus done, they say *It is objected by some men that the seven* Cities, *in which these seven* Asian Churches *had their seat, were all of them Metropolitical, and so had relation to the rest of the* Towns *and* Cities *of* Asia, *as unto daughters rising under them, and that therefore these* Churches *were Metropolitical* Churches, *and their* Angels *Metropolitical* Bishops.

2. How this comes to be styled an *objection* I cannot well guesse, or what it is, against which it is thought to be *objected*. The truth of it, as farre as any *Episcopal* person I know, is interessed in it, is this, It is not onely evident of the *Angels* of the *seven Asian Churches*, that they were *Bishops*, which is sufficient for us against the *Assemblers*, but there is over and above that, all reason to deem them *Starres* of a *first magnitude*, i. e. *Bishops* of *Mother-Cities*, *Metropolitanes* and that very pertinent to be urged in this matter of the *Asian Angels*, not to secure the proofes of *Episcopacy* taken from thence, but to render a reason why in all *Asia* but *seven Churches* and their *Bishops* are named there. To this purpose the

the discourse is inlarged (above what it needed to have been) *Differt.* 4. 5. to set downe the nature of *Metropolitanes*, the *exemplars* of them among the *Jewes*, the expresses of the *Institution* in the *Apostles* writings, and the *signal* evidences of it in the *Primitive Church*, and the *Antient Canons* in the *Councel* of *Nice* and *Antioch*, and *Ephesus*, all owning them as *Primitive* and *Apostolical Institutions*, and all this exemplified in *Jerusalem*, in *Antioch*, in *Rome*, in *Alexandria*, in *Gortyna* of *Creet*, and at length in all the *seven Churches of Asia*.

3. What is there thus set down, if it have not perfect truth in it, I shall be very glad to see the weake parts of that discourse discovered, and therefore though I never proposed or meant it as an *Objection* of ours against the *Presbyterians*, having no need of such *auxiliaries*, and the whole matter being sufficiently proved without it, and this onely added *ex abundanti*, yet I shall most willingly attend their motions, and see what *answers* they will adapt to this *Objection*, as they call it.

4. And 1. they answer, that it *will hardly be proved that these* seven Cities *were all of them* Metropolitical Cities *in S.* John's *dayes, And the scituation of most them lying neerer together on the Sea side makes it very improbable.*

5. To this I reply, that for *five* of them, *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, *Sardis*, *Pergamus*, and *Laodicaa*, *Pliny*, that lived and wrote in the beginning of *Vespatian's* reigne, is a competent witnesse, that they were *Cities* wherein the *Roman Proconsuls* fixt their *Courts* or *Seats* of *Judicature*, and administred *justice* there to all the *Cities* about them, and that is the *interpretation* of a *chiefe City* or *Metropolis*, in the *secular account*, and agreeably *Ulpian* mentions *Ephesus* as the *chief* of these *Metropoles*. And for the other two, *Philadelphia* and *Thyatira*, the latter of these by * *Ptolomee*, the former by the *Councel* of *Constantinople sub Mena* is punctually affirmed to be a *Metropolis*. To these are added other *evidences* and *reasons*, and the *Lord Arch-Bishop* of *Armagh* hath written (besides his *Original* of *Metropolitanes*) a very *learned Dissertation* of the *Lydian Asia*, on purpose to cleare this matter. Lib. 5. c. 29, 30.

*Greg. l. 5. c. 2.

6. And

6. And when a thing is so largely *proved* already, and when a *satisfactory* proofe of it in any *one* of the seven *Cities* is abundantly sufficient to the asserting of *Metropolitanes*, (for then the *Angel* of that *one* was a *Metropolitan*) 'tis then certainly a very incompetent confutation barely to say, that *it will hardly be proved, that these* seven Cities *were all of them* Metropolitical Cities *in Saint* John's *dayes*, for if it be *proved*, it matters not how *hardly*, and if any one were so in S. *John's* dayes, it matters not, if possibly some other were not, that one was a *Metropolitical Angel*, which is all we need insist on.

7. And for the *Argument* to make it *improbable*, drawn from the *situation* of the *Cities*, that is as *infirme*; for this, as all other controversies of *matters* of *fact*, must be waged by *authorities* of those which were likely to *know* the truth, and to testifie aright, and to those we have all reason to *adhere*, and not to be moved by *arguments* that seeme probable to those that live 1600. yeares after, and are not perhaps so perfect *Masters* of the *Geographie* of the place as duly to be able to judge even what is in that respect most *probable*.

8. Nay for the distances of these *Cities*, though I have not now Mr. *Brightman* by me, yet my notes out of him tell me, that in his scale of *furlongs*, *Pergamus* was distant from *Smyrna* 540. furlongs, *i. e.* about 68. *English miles*, and *Ephesus* from *Smyrna* 320. i.e. about 40. miles, and *Thyatira* from *Pergamus* 80. *English* miles, which is a distance very reconcileable with their being *Metropoles*.

9. But they are content to *suppose* this was true, and then have *answers* ready another way, 1. *That it is no good argument from the greatnesse of the* Cities *to inferre the greatnesse of the* Churches, *for though the* Cities *were great, yet the* Churches *were but small, and the number of believers very few in comparison of the rest of the people.*

10. To this I reply, 1. by *concession*, that in all places and times the greatnesse of the *Church* cannot absolutely be concluded from the *greatnesse* of the *City*, because it is possible that a *great City* may have utterly *resisted* the *faith*, and a

lesser

leſſer City *received* it; or againe a *greater City*, that hath received the *Faith* in ſome of the Members, may yet have *fewer* believers in it, than another City, which is not ſo great. This therefore is not our way of concluding, from the bare *greatneſſe* of the *Cities*, to infer the great number of *believers* in them.

11. Our way of *concluding* is this; *Paul* had ſpent *three yeares*, *Act.*20.31. in this *Lydian* or *Proconſular Aſia*, ver.18. In this time he had purſued his worke very *diligently* and *zealouſly*, not *ceaſing to warne every one night and day with teares*, and herein his *harveſt* was proportionable to his *labour*; After *two years* ſpace and upwards ſpent at *Epheſus*, it is ſaid, *ver.*19. that by the continuance of his *preaching* and gathering *Diſciples*, *all they that dwelt in* Aſia, *heard the Word of the Lord both* Jews *and* Greeks, and though many were *hardned* and *believed not*, and *ſpake evil of that way*, ver.9. yet ver.17. by ſome *extraordinary* workes of his, which were made *knowne to all the* Jews *and* Greeks *dwelling at* Epheſus, *feare fell on them all*, *and the name of the Lord Jeſus was magnified*, a converſion in a manner *general*, and therefore it followes, *and many that believed*—ver. 18. and *ſo mightily grew the word of God and prevailed*, ver. 20. Whereupon Saint *Paul* himſelfe ſpeaking of theſe ſucceſſes, calls it a *great dore and an effectual*, 1 *Cor.*16.9. which at *Epheſus*, v. 8. was *opened* unto him.

12. From hence we conclude, and ſure ſafely may, 1. that in *Aſia* generally, and eſpecially in *Epheſus* there was a great number of *Chriſtians*, before this time of *Chriſts Epiſtle*, (which is not a concluding it barely from the *greatneſſe* of that or any other *Cities* of *Aſia*) Secondly from hence, together with *Epheſus*'s being in the *ſecular account* (the *Notitiæ Imperiales*) a *Metropolis*, where the *Aſſizes* were kept, we conclude that *Epheſus* was in the *Chriſtian* account alſo a *Metropolis*, and the *chiefe* of all *Aſia*; and this I hope is not ſo *improbable* infirme a way of *concluding*, as the other impoſed on us ſeemed to be.

13. Thirdly, from hence, and from other exemplifications of it (as that *Trallis* and *Magneſia*, which appeare to be

under the *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, are by *Ignatius* written to as all *Episcopal Sees*, in our present notion of the word *Bishop*) we conclude that *other* Cities of *Asia* beside these *seven*, had received the *Christian* faith, and were certainely taken care for by *Paul*, which had planted it among them, and agreeably had *Rulers* setled in them, i. e. *Bishops* subordinate to the *Metropolitans*. And all these inferences I doubt not will appeare regular enough, and I should farther *enlarge* on them, if there were any thing in the *answer*, which could render it *needful* or *seasonable*.

14. As for the *paucity* of *Christians* in those times in *comparison* of the rest of the people, that cannot be pertinently opposed to our pretensions, because still the number of *Christians* in a *great* City might beare the same *proportion* to the number of the *Christians* in the *smaller* Cities, that the *people* in the one did to the *people* in the other, *one thousand* bearing the same *proportion* to *one hundred*, that an *hundred thousand* doth to *ten thousand*.

15. And it being the affirmation of *Clemens*, that the *Apostles* in *each City*, where they received any *proselytes*, though never so *few*, before their parting constituted a *Bishop* (with his *Deacon*), who was to be *governor* τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *of those that should after believe*, it followes unquestionably from thence, that in the *Cities* which had but *few Christians*, *Bishops* might be and were *constituted*, and those very regularly depending on the *greater* (their *Metropolitical*) Cities, from whence the *faith* was derived to them, (as from *Ephesus*, where *Paul* chiefly resided, to the Cities about it) and all this without any need of *ballancing* the *parties*, or considering what *comparison* the number of the *Christians* in one, or the other, bore to the number of the *unbelievers* in either *City*. And let this serve by way of Reply to the first branch of the second answer.

Section

Section XVI.

Of modelling Churches according to the Government of the Roman *state. Of exemplars of Metropolitans among the* Jewes. *Testimonies of the Apostles instituting Metropolitans.*

THeir *second answer* is, *we doe not believe that ever it can be proved that the Apostles did model the Government of the Church, according to the Government of the* Roman *state. This was the after policy of Christian Emperours and Bishops, but no part of Apostolicall policy; And therefore it doth not follow, that because there were divers Cities under the jurisdiction of those* 7. *Cities, that therefore there should be divers Churches subordinate to the* 7. Asian *Churches.* Numb. 1.

2. That the *Apostles*, which designed to plant a *Church* in the *Heathen* World, should doe it in that manner as would be most *advantagious* to their *end*, will not I hope be accounted *strange*. This generally was by betaking themselves to the *Cities*, rather than the *villages*, and first to the *greater Cities*, unto which was the most *frequent resort*, that by that meanes the *faith* might be most *compendiously* and *successfully* propagated. If a *greater City* resisted their *preaching*, or fewer *Saints* were gathered there, I do not then pretend to prove, or to believe that that was constituted a *Metropolitan Church* with *superiority* over others of greater *antiquity*, or larger *growth* in the *faith*, whatsoever the *dignity* of it were in the *secular* account; But when a whole *Nation* is converted, and the greatest and most populous *Cities first*, and from thence the *sound gone out into all the Region*, and lesser *Cities* in it, that then the *Apostles*, which certainly constituted *Bishops* in every *believing City* (and therefore what is reported to have been done κατ' ἐκκλησίαν *in every Church*, Acts 14.23. is appointed to be done κατὰ πόλιν *in every City*, Tit. 1.5) should set up the *principall Sees* in those most *Christian Cities*, which had formerly the *priority* in the *Romane* state, as it is the *wisest* method, and fittest for the *wisest* planters to take, so we have all reason to believe it was done particularly in the

Lydian or *Proconsular Asia*, in which there being many more *Christian Cities*, than those *seven*, to whom *Christ's Epistle* is addrest, those are in all reason to be accounted the *chiefe* of that *Region*, and those which are not named, lesse *principall* than they: which concurring with what we finde recorded in *Pliny* and *Ptolomy* of the account of them in the *imperiall noticia*, if it *demonstrate* not, is yet matter of exceeding great *probability*, and may perswade with any reasonable man, as long as there is nothing in any degree such, which is offered to be *confronted* against it.

3. If that which scandalizeth the *Assemblers* (for we are left to *Divine* what it is) be the *unfitnesse* that the *Apostles* should modell the *Church* according to the *Roman state*. I shall first demand how it is possible to imagine a *plantation* of a *Church* in any, whether *Jewish* or *Heathen* state, without doing somewhat *equivalent* to this? For suppose *Joseph* of *Arimathea* to have (as * *Gildas* saith) converted the *Britannick church* in *Tiberius*'s time, is it to be imagined that he should meddle with the *civill* power of this Nation, as it stood in respect of it's *separation* from other *Nations*, *toto divisa Orbe*, or with the *divisions* or *distributions* of this *Nation* within it selfe, into *Cities*, and *Provinces*, &c. or goe about to innovate any thing in that matter? Is it not certaine that it was no part of the *Christian faith* to be such a *judge* or *divider*; but on the other side that all should remaine as it did (in that respect) before the coming of *Christianity*? And therefore supposing 1. That this *Nation* were governed by a *King* of its own; is it not certaine that this *nationall Church* should follow the boundaries of the *Nation*, and so be modeld according to the *government* of the (formerly *Heathen*) *Britannick state*? And supposing againe (what hath already been proved by the *testimony* of *Clemens*, and by comparing *Act.* 14. 23. with *Tit.* 1. 5.) that a *Bishop* were constituted in every *Church*, in each *City*, will there be any reason of doubting but that those *Cities* being *subordinate* one to another, according to the *customes* of the *Nation*, the *Churches* in those *Cities*, and the *Bishops* in those *Churches* shall be so also? This I hope will not be deemed an impious compliance

* *De excid. & Conqu. Brit.*

with

with *heathenisme*, or *conformity* with the *World*, nay, though the *Emperour* of *Rome* (by his conquests here) were the author of these *distributions*.

4. But then secondly, it is already cleared in the *Dissertations*, that this *Ecclesiastick* division of *Cities* into *Mothers* and *Daughters*, *Metropoles* and *inferiour Cities*, was by the *Apostle* copied out from the *Jewes*, as when *God* commands by *Moses*, that *Judges* and *Officers* should be *ordained* in every *City*, *Deut.*16.18. and that in matters of *weight* and *doubt* they should resort to *Jerusalem*, to the *Judge* and *Sanhedrim* there, according to which it appeares that *Jerusalem* was the *Metropolis* of those other *Cities*, and so is evident, *Act.*9. by the story of *Saul* carrying Letters of *Commission* from the *Sanhedrim* there to the *consistories* in *Damascus*, and by many other evidences. So likewise *Numb.*3. when *three Families* of the *Levits*, the *sonnes* of *Aaron*, were *separated for the service of the Tabernacle*, and an *head* or *Prince* or *President* of every of these, called נשיא *v.*24. 30. 35. *Eleazar Aaron's Sonne* is constituted over all these, and styled נשיא נשיאי *the head of the heads of the Levites*. This is clearly a patterne of the *Metropolitanes* in the *Christian Church*, which may therefore owne it's derivation from thence, and not from the *Heathen models* of *Government*, which yet it was not reasonably to disturbe, being found so *concordant* to, and commodious for it.

5. And that what was done in this kind, was done by the *Apostles* themselves and *Apostolicall* persons, the first *founders* of Churches, and not onely by the *after policy* (as is suggested) of *Christian Emperours* and *Bishops*, might have appeared abundantly by these few testimonies, if they had been worthy to be taken notice of. First, of the *councell* of *Nice An.Domini* 325. not many yeares after the *conversion* of *Constantine*, the first *Christian Emperour*, Can.6. which takes care for the *preserving the priviledges of the Metropolitanes* (by name that the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* should have power over the *Churches* in *Ægypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*, that in *Antioch* and the rest of the *Provinces* τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, *the priveleges should be preserved to*

the Churches) begins with this rule τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *Let the antient customes continue in force,* which certainly referres to that which was long before the *Christian Emperours,* and (without any reason of doubting) to the first *constitutions* of those *Churches* by St. *Marke,* and St. *Peter,* and then the *Canon* goes on to exact this by way of *conformity* with other places, with *Rome* it selfe, Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τέλος συμβέβηκεν, *for this is the custome of force with the Bishop of* Rome, and upon these grounds the Canon requires καθόλου *universally,* that if any man be made a *Bishop* χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ Μητροπολίτου, *without the judgement of the Metropolitan, he ought not to be Bishop*—

6. So in the 9. Canon of the *Councell* of *Antioch,* in the yeare 341. which begins thus, that *the Bishop, which presides in the Metropolis, ought to know the Bishops in every Province, and to take care of the whole Province,* διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ Μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς τὰ πράγματα ἔχοντας, *because all that have businesse, resort from all sides to the Metropolis* (which is the very thing we now contend, to be the *reason* of conforming the *Ecclesiastick* to the *civill* models) and then proceeds to forbid other *Bishops* acting any thing of such a nature without him, this is backt with these words, κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κανόνα κεκρατηκότα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, *according to the antient* Canon *of our Fathers, which hath been in force,* referring againe to the *immemoriall custome* of all Churches since the first *plantation,* and not the *after-policie of Christian Emperours and* Bishops, as is here suggested.

7. Lastly, in the last *canon* of the *Great councell* of *Ephesus,* in the yeare 431. (which is the defining a speciall matter of Metropoliticall right), where the occasion of the *controversie* is rehearsed, how the *Bishop* of *Antioch* invaded the *priviledges* of the *Cypriots,* contrary to the ἀρχαῖον ἔθος the *antient custome,* and the decree is made that the *Bishops* of *Cyprus* shall *retaine* them *inviolate,* καὶ τὰς κανόνας τῶν ὁσίων πατέρων, καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, *according to the* Canons *of the Holy Fathers, and the antient custome*; The Canon extends it selfe to all other *Dioceses* and *Provinces,* that no *Bishop*

shop shall meddle with *another* Province ἐκ ἴσου ἄνωθεν ἢ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτῷ ἡγουμένου τῶν περὶ αὐτῷ χωρῶν, *which was not upward and from the beginning under his*, i. e. *his predecessors power*, where it is most evident that the *Metropolitical power*, and *primacy Ecclesiastical* is derived from the *beginning* of the *plantation* of each *Church*, and consequently that this was a part of *Apostolicall policy*, and not onely an *after policy* of Christian Emperours, &c.

8. And upon these grounds of probation, I shall be competently secured that this is proved, which they doe not *believe ever can be*, and have no other argument to prove their *negative*, but their not *believing* the *affirmative*.

Section XVII.

Of the objection against Metropoles from the seven Starres *in seven Churches.*

OF the same temper is their third *answer*, that they *are fully assured that it can never be made out, that any of these* Asian Angels *were* Archbishops *or* Bishops *over other* Bishops, *or* Bishops *over divers settled Churches. The seven* Starres *are said in Scripture to be fixed in their seven Candle-stickes or Churches, not one* Starre *over divers Candle-stickes or Churches.* Num. 1.

2. What they are already *fully assured* of, that *it can never be made out*, I shall have little confidence to *perswade* them was *formerly* done to their hands; Otherwise I should hope that by what had long since been said, and hath now been more *largely* deduced in *Reply* to their last *answer*, they might find cause to alter their *judgements*, and retract their so *definitive* sentence of *full assurance*?

3. As for the onely *appearance* of *reason*, which is here superadded, *viz.* that the *seven Stars* are found *fixed in seven*, not one *over divers Churches*, this I conceive not to be of any force. For it being by us *granted* and presumed that *each* of the *seven Asian Angels* was *Bishop* of his particular *Church*, one of *Ephesus*, another of *Smyrna*, &c. It is perfectly reconcileable

cileable herewith, that in case these *seven* were not the onely Cities and Churches in *Asia* (as it is certaine they were not, all *Asia*, consisting of *many* more Cities, being before this converted to the *Faith*) all the other might have *dependance* on these *seven*.

4. For this we know, that two *Bishops* in *England*, that were each of them, first in one *City*, for example in *Canterbury* or *Yorke*, had yet each of them a *superiority* or *Metropoliticall* power over divers other Cities, and when any *Record* styles one of them *Bishop* of *Canterbury*, as the *Scripture* doth *Angel* of *Ephesus*, we should sure acknowledge it a very infirme inference from the words of that *Record*, to conclude that being *Bishop* of *Canterbury* he could not be *Metropolitan* of *London*, *Rochester*, &c.

5. And this is the very parallel to the present instance, and if it were not *invalid* enough, by being a bare *negative* argument [*they are not said in Scripture to be one* Starre *over divers Churches*] (all things that *are*, are not *said* in *Scripture*, those *Angels* have not therefore no *names*, because they are not there recorded) this parallel instance, which supposes the *contrary* to their pretensions, would be sufficient to *invalidate* it.

Section XVIII.

Of the use of the word Bishop for Archbishop in Tertullian: *Of* Angel *in Christs Epistle.*

Numb. 1. A *Fourth answer*, or rather *confutation*, is added, That *if this opinion were true, then* Tertullian *did not doe well in saying that St.* John *made* Polycarpe *Bishop of* Smyrna, *but he should rather have said that he made him Archbishop. And our Saviour* Christ *had not given to these seven* Angels *their due Titles, for he must have written to the* Angel *of the Church of* Ephesus, *together with all those Churches in the Cities subordinate to* Ephesus. *And so likewise of the other six.*

2. To this I reply, that the affirming the *seven Angels* to have been *Metropolitanes*, no way obligeth us to find fault either

either with *Tertullians* or our *Saviour's* ſtyle. Not with *Tertullian's*, for 1. an *Arch-Biſhop* is a *Biſhop*, though dignified above ſome others of that order. Secondly, ſuppoſing *Smyrna* to be a *Metropolis* (as no doubt, if it were, *Tertullian* knew and ſuppoſed it to be) then his ſtyling *Polycarp Biſhop* of *Smyrna*, is æquivalent to his calling him a *Metropolitan* or *Archbiſhop*, As acknowledging *Canterbury* to be a *Metropolitical See* in *England*, the affirming *William Laud* to be conſtituted *Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, is all one, as to affirme him *Archbiſhop*.

3. Thus when * *Chryſoſtome* ſaith of *Titus*, that ὁλόκληρος νῆσος καὶ τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κρίσις, *an intire Iſland and the judgement of ſo many Biſhops* was committed to him, what is this but to affirme *Titus Arch-biſhop* of *Crete*? And yet * *Euſebius*, who believed this, and adverted to it, as much as *Chryſoſtome*, uſes this phraſe, τῶν ἐν Κρήτῃ ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπῶν εἰληφέναι, *that he was Biſhop of the* Churches *of* Creet, calling him *Biſhop* diſtinctly, though by the mention of the *Churches* in the *plural*, 'tis evident he meant the ſame that we doe by *Arch-Biſhop*. * *In Tit. 1. Hom. 1.* * *Lib. 3. cap 4.*

4. So againe * *Euſebius* of *Irenæus*, that he τὰς κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικίας ἐπισκόπει, *was Biſhop of the Provinces of France*, which muſt needs ſignifie *Archbiſhop* of *Lyons*, for ſo he was. And 'tis certaine that other of the *Antients* uſe the word Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος *Arch-Biſhop*, of thoſe which were no otherwiſe qualified for that title, as when Saint *Cyprian* the *Biſhop* of *Carthage*, under which the whole *Province* of *Africk* is comprehended, is by the * *Councel* of *Conſtantinople* called Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀφρων χώρας, *Arch-Biſhop of the Region of Africk*. * *Lib 5. cap. 23.* * *In Trullo. can. 2.*

5. The ſame anſwer will competently ſuffice, for the reconciling *Chriſt's* ſtyle and ours, for ſuppoſing *Epheſus* to have been a *Metropolis*, the writing to the *Angel* of that *Church*, implyes writing to thoſe other *Churches* in the *Cities* ſubordinate to *Epheſus*, and need not be more fully expreſt, as when the *Apoſtle* wrote to the *Church* of *Corinth*, and not onely ſo, but to *all the Saints* (and ſo all the *Churches*) *in all Achaia*. 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. 'tis certaine that the former *Epiſtle* was

written to those very same Churches (viz. all under the *Metropolis* of Corinth) and yet it is inscribed *to the* Church *of* God *which is at* Corinth, 1 Cor. 1. 1. without mentioning of *Achaia*, save onely in a general *indefinite* phrase, *with all that in every place call on the name of Jesus.*

6. Secondly, the word in *Christ's Epistle* being not *Bishop* but *Angel*, is not at all lyable to this *exception*, For why may not an *Arch-Bishop* be as fitly called an *Angel*, as a *Bishop* would be? nay if it be remembred what was formerly cited out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom.* 6. that there are *seven Angels which have the greatest power*, by him styled πρωτόγονοι Ἀγγέλων ἀρχοντες, *the first-borne rulers of the Angels*; parallel to the phrase in *Dan.* 7. 10. 13. שרים הראשנים the *head*, *Lords* or *chiefe Princes*, or, as we ordinarily stile them, the *Archangels*, of which number *Michael* is there named to be one, There will then be more than a tolerable *propriety* of speech in *Christ's* style, a most exact critical notation of their being *Arch-Bishops*, and withall a farther account of *Tertullian's* calling *Polycarp* a *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, though he were *Arch-Bishop*, just as the *Archangels* in *Daniel* are more than once called *Angels* in the *Revelation*.

7. For a close of this mater they are pleased to adde their Character, not over-benigne of those by whom this *device*, as they style it, *was found out for the honour of Archpiscopacy*, [*that they did aspire unto that dignity*.]

8. If hereby be meant the *Lord Primate* of *Ireland* in his discourse of the *Original* of *Bishops*, this character can have no *propriety* in it, he having quietly enjoyed that *dignity* many yeares before the writing hereof. If it be designed for a reproach to *me*, I shall elude the blow by not thinking it such. For as at a time when *Episcopacy* it selfe was by the *Parliament* abolisht, (and that *Act* of *severity* actually put in *execution*) it had been a great *folly* in any to hope that he should ever attaine to that *Office* of *Dignity* in the *Church*, (and what ever other follies I have been guilty of, truly that was none of them) so I thinke there could not a point of time more commodiously have been chosen in the space of above 1600. yeares, wherein a man might have better secured

cured a *Discourse* for *Bishops* and *Metropolitanes*, from the *Censure* of *aspiring* to either of those *Dignities*, than was that, wherein that Book was *published*.

9. To this if I adde by way of *retortion*, that it is evident that they which write this *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, doe aspire every one of them to their part of a *Ruling Presbytery*, which their *brethren* that have not those *Ambitions* are farre from thinking to have any *Divine Stamp* upon it, I shall have given an account of the unskilfulnesse of their *Reproaches*, as well as of the *invalidity* of their *Answers*.

10. As for the *feare* which their Discourse on this matter suggests to their more *moderate brethren*, that if a *Jus Divinum be stampt on Archbishops and Primates, and Patriarchs*, they may be *forced* by the same proportion to put a *Divine stamp* upon the *Pope* himselfe, I perswade my selfe that I have given the *ingenious* reader a satisfactory account of the inconsequence hereof, in a *Discourse* of *Schisme*, to which I shall refer him, if he need, or desire farther *trouble* or *direction* in this businesse.

Section XIX.

Of Division into Parishes, and Union into Dioceses. Of Diocesan Bishops in the Apostles dayes. Elders in every Church, Act. 14. Elders of the Church, Act. 20. That place vindicated from exception.

After all this, they adde a *fourth* (whether *Answer* or *suppletory Consideration*) for the *conclusion* of this Discourse concerning the *Asian Angels*, and I shall follow them to that more cheerfully, because it lookes like a *conclusion*. Numb. 1.

2. It is this, *That it can never be proved that these Asian Angels were Bishops in a Prelaticall sense, much lesse Arch-Bishops and Metropolitanes. For it is believed upon all parts, that believers in great Cities, were not divided into set and fixt Congregations and parishes, till long after the Apostles dayes, and that*

Parishes were not united into Dioceses till 260. years after Christ. And therefore sure we are that there could not be Diocesane Churches and Diocesane Bishops formerly so called in the Apostles dayes; These Angels were Congregationall, not Diocesan. In the beginning of Christianity the number of Believers, even in the greatest Cities were so few, that they might well meet ὅλη τὸ ἀυτὸ in the same place. And these were called the Church of the City, and therefore to ordaine Elders κατ' ἐκκλησίαν and κατὰ πόλιν, are all one in Scripture.

3. To the *preface* of this conclusion, that *it cannot be proved*—] it is againe very sufficient to answer, that when a *proposition* hath already been proved so farre, that no answer hath been rendred, which at all satisfies, or invalidates the force of the proofes, it is very unlike Artists to say, that *it cannot be proved.* Nay, although some *inconvenience* were producible, which would presse our *assertion* yet the old rule would require it's place, *incommodum non solvit argumentum*, the mention of an *inconvenience* insuing, doth not take off the force of an *argument.*

4. But we need not that wariness here; the reason which is here annext to prove that *it cannot be proved*, is of no force against us, For 1. as Congregations and Parishes are *synonimous* in their style, so I yeild that Believers in great Cities were not at first divided into Parishes, while the number of the Christians in a City was so small, that they might well *assemble* in the *same place*, and so needed no *partitions* or divisions.

5. But what disadvantage is this to us, who affirme that one *Bishop*, not a College of *Presbyters*, presided in this one Congregation, and that the Believers in the Region and Villages about, did belong to the care of that *single Bishop* of the *City-church?* May not these be ruled by a *Bishop* as well before, as after the division into Parishes? Or is this division more necessary to the *Government* by one *Bishop* in each City, than to the Government of more *Presbyters* in every City? In all reason the division of this one into severall Parishes should make *Presbyters* more necessary after than before such division, that each Parish might have one *Presbyter*, to officiate

ficiate among them in things of daily use; and upon that account I suppose it was, that when the number of Believers was so farre increased, that all the Christians of a City could not meet commodiously in one place, and when the Regions and Villages so abounded with *Proselytes* that in respect of them also it was necessary, then the *Bishop* of each City thought fit to constitute *Presbyters*, in our moderne notion of them, many in every City, and many in every Region, one in every Village, though as yet the word Parish, in our moderne sense, was not come into the World.

6. And so this is farre from being *Argumentative* against us, it is rather usefull to confirme what is asserted by us, that it is against the whole *Scheme* which the Scriptures or first writers give us of Churches, to imagine that in every City there was by the *Apostles* a *College* of *Presbyters* constituted, when as they agree to assure us a *Bishop* and his *Deacon* were sufficient at the first (for them) Plantations.

7. So againe when they take it for granted that Parishes were *not united into Dioceses till* 260. *yeares after Christ*; I shall aske them whether they were sooner *divided* into *Classes*, &c. and if not, what they have gained to their *Jus Divinum* by this observation?

8. But then secondly, 'tis cleare that there might be *Dioceses* before this division into *Parishes*, in our moderne notion; For what is a *Diocese* but a *Church* in a *City* with the *Suburbs* and *Territorie* or *Region* belonging to it? And this certainly might be, and remaine under the *Government* of a *single Bishop*, as well *before*, as *after* any more minute distributions into such, as we now call *Parishes*.

9. For it is one thing for the *Church* of this City to be divided from the *Church* of every other City, another thing for the same *Church* to be divided into *many Assemblies*; The first is it which is required for the setting up of *Government*; and of any such *Church* so bounded there may be a *Bishop*, and that whole *Church* shall be his *Diocese*, and so be a *Diocesan Bishop*, though as yet this *Church* be not subdivided into more severall *Assemblies*.

10. And therefore when they adde, that *there could not*

be Dioceſan Churches *and* Biſhops *formerly ſo called in the* Apoſtles *dayes*, unleſſe they have ſome little *equivocation* in the word *Dioceſan*, It is moſt certaine they have no reaſon on which to found their *confidence*, For that there was a *Church* in each City, and it's *territory* (howſoever *governed* by *one* or *more*) is moſt certaine, and equally affirmed by them and us, and equally their intereſt and ours, that it be affirmed. As for the uſe of the word Διοικησις, that hath oft *varied*, and hath ſometimes been of a *larger*, ſometimes of a *narrower* ſignification, and ſo hath Παροικια, the *originall* of our *Pariſh* alſo, but I hope our contentions muſt not be alwayes about *words*, when the matter is ſufficiently agreed on among us, and the words ſufficiently explained to expreſſe that matter.

11. And therefore when they adde theſe *Angels* were *congregationall*, not *Dioceſan*, the reply is obvious, they were every of them *Angels* of a *Church* in a *City*, having *authority* over the *Region* adjacent, and pertaining to that *City*, and ſo as *Church* and *Congregation* are all one (as in ordinary uſe in all languages they are) they were *Congregationall* and *Dioceſan* alſo.

12. What followes of the *paucity* of *believers* in the *greateſt* Cities, and their *meeting in one place*, as alſo of a *Church* and City being all one, is willingly granted by us, and hath not the leaſt appearance of being *uſefull* to their pretentions, or *hurtfull* to ours, and therefore I have no temptation to make any the leſt *Reply* to it.

13. That which next followes, though it concerne us not to *examine* it, our intereſt being equally ſecured, be it true or falſe, yet I cannot but take ſome notice of it in paſſing, becauſe it is a little *extraordinary*.

14. *Afterwards*, ſay they, *we conceive that believers became ſo numerous in theſe great* Cities, *as that they could not conveniently meet in one place; Thus it was in the Church of* Jeruſalem, *Act.* 2. 41. *and* 4. 4. *and* 5. 14. *and thus poſſibly it might be in moſt of theſe* Aſian Churches *in St.* John's *time.*

15. Here certainly the word [*Afterwards*] is relative, and re-

referrs to the *Antecedent* in the former Paragraph, and that is, [*In the beginning of Christianity*] Hereupon I demand, what time is that which they call [*the beginning of Christianity?*] Is it that wherein Christ continued on the Earth? If so, they will easily believe us, that we doe not think, that *Diocesan* Bishops were placed in the Church, within that *period* If it be the time immediately following the Resurrection of *Christ*, when the Apostles began to preach and propagate the Faith, then how come they to divide that time, which is spoken of *Act.* 2. 41. from that time of the *beginning* of *Christianity*, by this word [*Afterward*] for tis certain what is there storied of the 3000. Converts, is the effect of the *first Sermon* preached by any of the Apostles immediately upon the descent of the *Holy Ghost* upon them, and the *gift of Tongues*, the wonderment whereof brought those so many Auditors together.

16. So secondly when they say of this point of time, *Act.* 2. 41. *The believers were so numerous that they could not conveniently meet in one place*, This is contrary to the evidence of the *Text*, which saith expresly *v* 44. *That all the believers were* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, which in the *last paragraph*, they interpreted, *meeting in one and the same place.* The like might be said of the other places *Act.* 4. 4. and 5 14. for certainly, as yet though the *number* of *Believers increased*, yet they were not distributed into severall *Congregations*. But this by the way, being assured that this disquisition is perfectly extrinsecall to the matter in debate betweene us, because as at *Jerusalem* the antients are cleare in affirming, that soone after Christ's Ascension, * *Peter* and *James* and *John* chose *James the just*, the *Brother of the Lord*, and constituted him *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, which is all that we need pretend to from the story of that Church, so it matters not much at what *point* of time that was done, whether at the very *beginning* or *afterwards*, much lesse how soone it was that that Church was distributed into severall divided *Assemblies*, the Creation of the *Bishop* not at all depending on that, as hath formerly been shewed.

17. Hence will it appeare to how very little purpose are those

* Πέτρον, φησὶ, καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάνην—μὴ ἐπιδικάζοντος δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν Δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἱδρύσαντο. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* l. 2. c. 1. *Ex. Clem.* ὑπολυπώσεις.

those *cautions* added, and *observations* made in the remaining part of this sixt Chapter.

18. *Thus*, say they, *possibly it might be* (i.e. the *believers* be so *numerous* in great *Cities*, that they could not *conveniently meet in one place*) *in most of these* Asian *Churches in St.* John's *time. But yet notwithstanding all this, there are three things diligently to be observed*; *First, that these meeting places were frequented promiscuously and indistinctly, and that believers were not divided into set and fixed Churches or Congregations in the Apostles dayes.*

19. But first I demand, Is there any truth in this observation? was not the Church of *Jerusalem* in the Apostles dayes a set and fixed Church, so as to be perfectly severed from the Church of *Alexandria* and *Ephesus*? Was not *James* the Brother of the Lord *Bishop* of the one, and not of the other?

20. Secondly, why was this for the *Presbyterians* intereſt to be so *diligently observed*? If one of these Churches were not thus *divided* and severed from others, how could it be *governed* by a *Presbytery*, as they pretend it was? Must it not be a *determinate fixed* body that is governed by any, whether *Bishop* or *Presbyters*? I professe not to be able to discerne by my most *diligent observation*, why this was so necessary to be so *diligently observed*.

21. Secondly, (say they, it must be as *diligently observed*) *that notwithstanding these different meeting places, yet the Believers of one* City *made but one* Church *in the Apostles dayes, as is evident in the* Church *of* Jerusalem, *which is called a* Church *not* Churches, *Act.* 8.1. & 15.6. & 22.16. *And so likewise it is called the* Church *of* Ephesus, *and the* Church *of* Thyatira, *&c. not* Churches, *&c.*

22. This *Observation* I acknowledge to have perfect *truth* in it, and not to be confutable in any part (save onely that the two latter *Texts* are certainly *misquoted*, and not rectified in the *Errata*) and therefore instead of rejecting, I shall imbrace it, and from thence *conclude*, that there is no manner of *incongruity* in assigning of one *Bishop* to one *Church*, and so one *Bishop* in the *Church* of *Jerusalem*, because it is

a

a *Church* not *Churches*, being forced to acknowledge that where there were *more Churches* there were *more Bishops*, and so likewise *one Angel* of *Ephesus*, and of *Thyatira*, &c. This I suppose was not the thing they meant to inferre from hence, nor indeed doe I conceive it necessarily inferred from (onely very agreeable to) the *oneness* of each *Church*, without other *arguments* to joyne with it. But I am still to seek, and emand what advantage accrues to their cause, or disadvantage to ours by this *observation?*

23. But then thirdly they adde, that *this* Church *in the* City *was governed in the Apostles dayes by the common councell of* Presbyters *or* Bishops.

24. This indeed were worth their *diligent observing*, if it could be descried, and would abundantly recompence them for the no-profit their *two* former *observations* brought them in, if it could be obtained by all their *diligence*. But this being the τὸ ζητούμενον, the *onely* thing in *question* betwixt us, whether the *Church* in each *City* was in the *Apostles* dayes governed by the *common councell* of *Presbyters* or *Bishops*, or by one *single Bishop*, called sometimes πρεσβύτερος *Elder* (as that signifies simply a *Governour*, not with restriction, a member of a *College* of *Governours*) this I say being the onely *question* in debate betweene us, it must not be any farther yeilded to them, than their *proofes* and evidences will enforce it; And these of what virtue they are, must now appeare by the *view* of them. And the first they produce is this.

25. *The* Apostles *went about ordeining* Presbyters *in every* Church, *Act.* 14 23.

26. But surely this is an *infirme* argument. *Every Church* signifies without question *more Churches* than one, *viz. Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Antioch*, v. 20. 21. And if in *each* of those *one* Πρεσβύτερος be supposed to be *ordeined*, that certainly will satisfie the importunity of that *Text*, and the mention of πρεσβυτέρους *Elders* in the *plurall*, viz. *foure Elders* in those so many *Churches*. And if because ἐκκλησίαν is in the *singular number*, they therefore thinke that those *plurall Elders* must be *ordeined* in *each* of those *Churches*. This is too grosse a

mistake for *Scholers* to be guilty of, it being certaine that that is not the *importance* of the phrase κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, any more than of the *English* [*Church by Church*] or [*in every Church*] i.e. *more Elders* in *more Churches*, *one* in every *one*.

27. Their next *proofe* is from *Act.* 20.17. Paul *called for the Elders of the Church of* Ephesus (*one of these seven Churches*) *and calls them Bishops, and commits the whole government of the Church to them*; *The like may be said of the other six* Churches.

28. What may be said of *Ephesus*, I grant may be said of the *other six Churches*, but the *Text* no where affirmes it of *Ephesus*, and so the *analogy* will no way prove it of the *rest*. All that the *Text* saith, is this, *And from* Miletus *he sent to* Ephesus *and called the Elders of the* Church. This is not to say the *Elders* (as that signifies *Presbyters* in our *moderne* notion) of the *one City*, and so *Church* of *Ephesus*, but the *Elders*, i.e. *Bishops* either of the *Asian Church* of that whole *Region*, or at least of the *Ephesine Province*, the neighbouring *Bishops* of the *Churches* or *Cities* that were under that *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, who by St. *Paul's* sending his summons to *Ephesus*, the *chiefe City* of the one, and *chiefe Metropolis* of the other (which consequently had daily meanes of *communicating* intelligence to those other *Cities*) might thus most *commodiously* be advertised of St. *Paul's* comming, and provide to meet him at *Miletus*.

29. That this is no *strain'd interpretation* or answer, is elsewhere evidenced, and may summarily appeare by these two testimonies, one of *Irenæus* here formerly mentioned, l. 3. c. 14. *ab Epheso & reliquis proximis civitatibus convocatos esse*, *that they were called from* Ephesus *and the rest of the neereſt Cities* adjoyning to it, This is an *expresse* evidence, which being allowed puts the whole matter out of *question*. And although in a matter of *fact*, a *testimony* of so credible a person that lived so neere the times, being an *auditour* of *Polycarpe* the first *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, and is not contradicted by any *contemporary*, is of a competent *authority*, and need not any other *Topickes* to assist it, yet for the removing all possible

possible prejudices from it, and rendring it yet more *indubitable*, I shall a little farther enlarge for the confirming of it.

30. And 1. the *Apostle* at his meeting with them, *v.* 18. begins in this *style*, *yee know from the first day that I came into* Asia, *after what manner I have been with you at all seasons*; An addresse to them, either as to the *Elders* of *Asia* indefinitely, as many as could conveniently come to *Miletus* at that time, or at least as to more than to the *Elder* (or *Elders*, if that could be truly pretended) of *one* City of *Asia*, peculiarly, or *exclusively* to all others.

31. So againe *v.* 25. *And now behold I know that yee all, among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdome of God, shall see my face no more*; This evidently addresses the speech not onely to the inhabitants of *one City*, but to all those (as many as were then present) *among whom hee had gone preaching the Faith of Christ*, and that we know was done by him to the *other Cities*, and not onely to that of *Ephesus*, κατὰ τὸν παροδὸν τὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διατρέχων κύκλον, *in passage* (though not so solemnly as at *Ephesus*) *going through all the Region and preaching the Gospell to all*, saith *Oecumenius* on 2 *Joh.* And so tis expresly said *Act.* 19.21. that after the *two yeares* and *three moneths* spent at *Ephesus*, ἐπέσχε χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, *he staid* and *spent some time in* Asia, And accordingly *v.*26. *Demetrius* truely saith, that *not onely at* Ephesus *but almost throughout all* Asia, Paul *had perswaded and turned away the people.*

32. Secondly, then the *Faith* being before this time successefully propagated through all *Asia*, and not onely in this one *City* of *Ephesus*, there were without question Churches accordingly gathered and compacted in many other *Cities*, as well as in *Ephesus*, before this time of *Paul*'s parting never to *see* them againe. And not onely in the other *Metropolis*, (*six* more of which are owned by the *Objectors*, *Smyrna* and the rest *Rev.* 1.) but also in the *lesser* Cities, which were not *Metropoliticall*, and yet more especially in those Cities which were neerest *Ephesus*, and which as belonging to that *Metropolis*, had frequent resort thither to the *Assises* which

were there kept *Act.* 19. 38. and so must be supposed to have received speciall influences from the *Apostle's* residing there for the space of *two yeares* and *three moneths*, Act. 19. 8. 10.

33. To which purpose it must againe be remembred, that as *Timothy* is by *Eusebius* styled τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἐπισκοπος, *Bishop of the Province that belongs to* Ephesus, l. 3. c. 4. which is all one as to make that a *Metropolis* over other Cities, and accordingly in the order of *Metropoliticall Sees* at the end of *Codinus*, the *Bishop* of *Ephesus* is called ὁ Ἐφέσου ὑπέρτιμος, καὶ Ἐξαρχος πάσης Ἀσίας, *Primate of all Asia*, so *Ignatius* in *Trajan's* time is by joynt consent of the *antients* affirmed to have written *Epistles* to two *Churches*, *Magnesia* and *Trallis*, which are known to be *Cities* under this *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, and to have named the *Bishops* of each, *Damas* of the one, and *Polybius* of the other.

34. And as there is no question among any but that *Ignatius* wrote such *Epistles* to those *Churches* (*Salmasius* cites that to the * *Trallians* expressly as the *Epistle* of *Ignatius*, which certainly he would never have done, if he had doubted whether ever *Ignatius* wrote to them; and indeed all that is questioned by him and D. *Blondell* is but this, whether the *Epistles* now extant under his name be *genuine* or no, not whether *Ignatius*, as all writers accord, wrote *seven Epistles*, of which these which we now speake of, are two) so there is no ground of imagining that they were of a *later plantation*, than that which is here recorded to be wrought by St. *Paul*, *Act.* 19. *All* Asia *having then heard the Faith*, v. 10. and received it in a remarkable manner *v.* 20. and a *great dore*, saith St. *Paul* being *opened* to him at *Ephesus* peculiarly, which must needs have influence on the Cities next adjoyning to it in a *speciall* manner.

* *Anacletum & Clementem Petri Ministros facit Ignatius in Epistolâ ad Trallenses.* Wal. Me p. 222.

35. To this I shall adde thirdly, that as * *Aristides* saith of *Ephesus*, that it was ταμεῖον κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας, the *common magazine* or *store-house* of *Asia*, καὶ τῆς χρείας καλαφυγὴ, their *refuge for all wants*, so it must needs be the fittest way of conveying *intelligence* speedily to all the *Cities* of *Asia*, especially the *proximæ civitates*, as *Irenæus* said, the Cities next adjoy-

* *Or. ad Asiat. Civ. de concord.*

adjoyning, and so most commodious to assemble those other *Bishops* to *Paul* at *Miletus* and not only him, or those that are supposed to have resided at *Ephesus*.

36. And accordingly we finde in *Eusebius*, that the *Epistle* of *Antonius* [illegible]*ius* concerning the *Christians*, which was to be communicated to all *Asia*, προετέθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας, *was proclaimed* or *divulged at* Ephesus, *in the common meeting of* Asia, as the readiest way to make it *universally* knowne. Eccl. Hist. l. 4. c. 23.

37. All which being premised, and withall that there is no reason to imagine, that St. *Paul* at the time of his *finall* parting, (taking his solemne last leave) of them *v.* 38. should not so much consider, as to call for, or desire to see any of the *rest* of his *Sonnes*, the *Governours* of the Inferiour (*hurches*, to whom he had committed that numerous flock (which was now so *universally* in such danger of *Wolves*) save onely those of the *one* (*hurch*, of that *one* City of *Ephesus* (supposing there had been more than one there.) This will be a very competent *confirmation* of *Irenæus* his *testimony*, that indeed thus it was, as he hath delivered, that the *Bishops* of the Cities neerest adjoyning to *Ephesus* (as many as by *summons* from thence could speedily be called together, in all reason the *Bishops* of the Cities which were under that *Metropolis*) were sent to meet the *Apostle* at *Miletus*, and accordingly met him there.

38. The second *testimony* is that maxime of the *Greeke Scholiast* on 1 *Pet.* 1. 5. Πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἡ τῶν Πράξεων βίβλος οἶδε λεγομένους. *The Booke of the* Acts *calls the Bishops Elders*, which being avow'd by me in the *Dissertations*, and cleared through all the places in the *Acts*, they ought, by all Lawes of *disputing*, either to have endeavoured the *refuting* of what is there said, or the proving that Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* must needs there signifie *Presbyters* in the *moderne* notion, which having not here attempted to doe, there is no kinde of force in what is here *dictated*, nothing said but what had beene long since largely and clearely *answered*.

39. Yet because in the next *Chapter*, where this place of

the Acts is viewed againe, one argument I see produced in favour of their *pretensions*, which they found in an *observation* of mine, I shall thinke my selfe concern'd to give an account of it.

40. It is this, Pag. 85. *If the Apostle by the Elders of the Church had meant the Bishops of the Church of all* Asia, *he would have said, not the Elders of the Church, but of the Churches. It is an observation made use of by one of those that makes use of this answer we are now confuting, That when the Scripture speakes of Churches in Cities it alwayes useth the singular number, as the Church of* Jerusalem, *the Church of* Corinth, *&c. but when it speakes of provinces where there are many Cities, then it uses the plurall number, as the Churches of* Judæa, *and the Churches of* Asia, *Rev.* 1. 11. *According to this observation, if the Apostle had meant of the Bishops of all* Asia, *he would have said the Elders of the Churches, whereas he calls them Elders of the Church, v.* 17. *and so must meane the Elders of the Church of* Ephesus, *and so meere* Presbyters, *not* Bishops.

41. But herein is a manifest *mistake*; For the *observation* is not made as is here suggested, of Churches in Cities and Provinces, that the former of them are *constantly* to be understood where there is mention of a Church in the *singular* number (without any name of *particular* City added to it) and that when a Province is mention'd, 'tis alwayes done by Churches in the *plurall* number; This is the sense on which their *argument* is founded. But if the *Reader* consult the *Dissertations* p. 190. He shall finde there is no such thing, 'tis onely this, That in the *New Testament* there is mention made of Churches in the *plurall* number, the Churches of *Judæa*, of *Samaria*, of *Galilee*, of *Syria*, of *Cilicia*, of *Galatia*, of *Asia*, of *Macedonia*, whereas in other places there was as frequent mention of a Church in the *singular*, the Church in *Jerusalem*, in *Antioch*, in *Cenchrea*, in *Corinth*, of the *Thessalonians*, of *Ephesus*, of *Smyrna*, of *Pergamus*, of *Thyatira*, of *Sardis*, of *Laodicaa*.

42. The cause of that difference is there said to be this, that *Judaa*, &c, was the name of a Province, in which there being

being many Cities, there were consequently many Churches and Bishops in them, whereas one City with the *territory* adjoyning to it being ruled by one *single Bishop*, was to be called a *singular Church*, and therefore that which is said to be done in *every Church*, Acts 14.13. is said to be done in *every* City. *Tit.*1.5. The sum of which observation is onely this, that one City, with the *territory* adjoyning to it never makes above one Church in the *Scripture* style, whereas a *Province* or *Country*, or *Nation* consists of *many Cities*, and so of many Episcopall *Sees* or Churches.

43. This was all that was said in that place, or that was usefull to be said in order to the end (to shew the *Originall* of *Metropolitanes*) there. And what a wresting of a plaine obvious observation is it, to conclude it from hence to be my *assertion*, that *when* (that must be, *whensoever*, or else the *conclusion* cannot be deducible from it) *the Scripture speakes of a Province, it is in the plurall number?* It doth sometimes do so, and that was all that was usefull to me. If it had done so but once, though twenty times it had done the contrary, it had been sufficient (for some reasonable account there must be for the doing it *once*, and what could that be, but the *number* of the Cities and so of Churches in each *Province* or *Nation*) much more when there were so *many* examples of it.

44. But this is not to *affirme* that it alwayes doth so, especially when being left at large without any restraint, not the Church of *Ephesus*, or the like, but *indefinitely* the Church, it is very capable of another *interpretation*. For sure when I wrote that, I had not forgotten my *Creede*, or in it the name *Church* in the *singular* number, which by the adjunct of *Catholike* must needs be more than the *Church* of one *City*. And having read *Mat.*16. where the whole *Church* of *Christ* is called *my Church* in the *singular*, a like phrase to that of the *Church of God*, which the Bishops here are commanded to *feed*, and in the one *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* having *six* examples of the word *Church* in the *singular*, each signifying evidently the *universall Church*, I might very well be allowed to discerne the word *Church* in the *singular*, without

any

any addition of *Ephesus* or the like, which restraines it in all the *examples* there produced, to be appliable to a farre *larger* body, than the *Church* of *one* City, and consequently be quit from all *obligation* of making the *Elders* of the *Church*, *Act.*20.17.the *Elders* of the *one* City of *Ephesus*.

45. There is little doubt I suppose but the *Church* of the whole World, consisting of many Churches, as the parts thereof, may be, and is in *Scripture* called the *Church* in the *singular*, and so certainly may the *Church* of a *Nation* or a *Province*, especially if it be united together under one *Primate* or *Metropolitane*, as it is certaine the *Churches* and *Cities* neer *Ephesus*, nay over all *Asia* were, according to the plaine words of St. *Chrysostome*, who when * others affirme of *Timothy* that he was by *Paul* ordained *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, expresseth the same thing thus, Δηλὸν ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὸν ὡς ἐμπεπιστευμένῳ ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἢ καὶ ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, *It is manifest that* Timothy *had a Church committed to him, or indeed an intire Nation, that of Asia.* The like is ordinarily observable of *Crete*, a whole *Island* with an *hundred* Cities in it (in each of which *Titus* was appointed to ordeine a *Bishop* or *Elder*) which yet is styled in the subscription of the *Epistle* to *Titus*, ἡ τῶν Κρητῶν ἐκκλησία, *the Church of Crete*, and the *subscription* never questioned upon that score by any, that it spake *improperly* herein.

* Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τῦ μεγάλυ Παύλυ χειροτονεῖται τῶν Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως Ἐπίσκοπος. *Anon. ap. Phot.* num. 254.

46. And consequently there can be no harshnesse in this interpretation, Paul *sent to* Ephesus *and call'd the Elders of the Church* to come to him to *Miletus*, and in his *Oration* addrest to them called them *Bishop* of the *flock* and of the *Church of God*, meaning them *singular præfects* of severall Cities of the *Church* of *Asia*, especially of those which were neerest *Ephesus*, the chiefe *Metropolis* of the whole Nation.

47. And so much in answer to that Objection, in defence of their argument from the Elders of *Ephesus*, as they call them.

48. Another *proofe* of the same is there added *Pag.* 85. Thus, *The Syriack translation reads it, he sent to* Ephesus, *and*

and called the Elders of the Church *of* Ephesus, *so Hierome, Presbyteros Ecclesiæ Ephesinæ*, so *concilium Aquisgranense.*

49. What authority St *Hierome*'s testimony is to carry with us in this matter, hath been elsewhere largely shewed, and we may hereafter have farther occasion to declare it, and our *reasons* of it. At the present it is willingly confest that St. *Hierome* on *Tit.* 1. doth indeavour to prove that in *Scripture*, *Bishop* and *Presbyter* is the same, and from him *Isidore Hispalensis de officiis Eccl.* l. 2. hath the same, and both have according to that *prolepsis* changed the words of the *Text* in the Acts, and instead of what there we reade, *sent to* Ephesus *and called the* Elders *of the Church*, *they* read, *sent to* Ephesus *and called the* Elders *of the same Church*, expressing themselves to meane of the *Church* of *Ephesus*. And the *councell* of *Aken* (*Aquisgranense*) having transcribed *nine Chapters* from *Isidore verbatim*, consequently doe the like. So that the authority of *Isidore* and that *councell* being as great as St. *Hierome* can make it, from whom evidently it proceeds, may yet be allowed to yeild to the farre greater authority of *Polycarp*'s *auditor Irenæus*, who hath sufficiently cleared it to the contrary.

50. As for the *Syriack* translation, it is not here recited exactly accordingly to the truth, For in that, thus the words lie: ומנה מן מילי טוס שרר איתי לקשישא דערתא דאפסוס, *And from* Miletus *he sent and called for the* Elders *of the Church of* Ephesus, where is but *one* mention of *Ephesus*, not *two*, as is here suggested from the *translation*, that it reades, *he sent to* Ephesus *and called the* Elders *of the Church of Ephesus*. The short of it is, *Ephesus* being but once named in that verse, the *Greeke* placeth it in the *beginning* ἀπὸ Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἔφεσον, *from* Miletus *he sent to Ephesus*, and this being the *Originall* must certainly over-rule all *translations*, and accordingly all *translations* but one to read it, onely the *Syriack* hath mis-placed the word *Ephesus*, put it in the *later* part of the period, quite against all *Syntaxis*, and for doing so, are here cited, and their *testimony* made use of to assist *Presbytery*, when the manifest truth in the

Originall, and by all other *translations* acknowleged, would not allow them any the least *advantage*.

51. After they had produced these two arguments, to prove that the *Church* in the *City* was *governed* in the *Apostles* days by a *Common-councell* of *Presbyters*, the Reader would hardly expect that which now next followes in these words.

From all this we gather, that the Asian *Angels were not Diocesan Bishops, but congregationall* Presbyters, *seated each of them in one Church, not any of them in more than one.*

52. This *conclusion*, as the words lie, consists of two parts, 1. That *each* of these *Asian Angels*, under the title of *Congregationall Presbyters*, was *seated in one Church*; This, if it were meant, as the words sound, were the granting to us all that we contend, and would hardly be reconciled with the *third observation*, that the *Church* in the *City* was governed by the *common councell* of *Presbyters*; For sure *each* of those *Presbyters* is not a *common councell*; But I rather believe they have not so soone disclaimed their *præmisses*, and therefore that it is more reasonable to interpret their *words* by their *principles*, than their *meaning* by their *words*, and so that by *congregationall Presbyters* they meant so many *Colleges* of such *Presbyters*, seated *each* of them, *i.e.* each of those *Colleges* in *one Church*; And if that be their *conclusion*, I must acknowledge it to accord perfectly with their *præmisses*, which being already *answered*, there remaines no force in the *conclusion*.

53. And for the second part, that *not any of them was seated in more than one*, understanding it againe as the words sound, it is no way *contrary* to our *pretensions*, for we doe not thinke that the *Angel* of *Ephesus* was seated in *Smyrna*, or in any *Church* but that of *Ephesus*, and the *territory* thereof; and although as that was a *Metropolis*, other *Cities* were under it, and so other *Bishops subordinate* to the *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, yet was not any other *City* the *Seat* of that *Metropolitane*, but onely *Ephesus*, whereof he takes his denomination, as although *Rochester* be under the *Metropolis* of *Canterbury*, yet the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* is not seated at *Rochester*, but

but some other *Bishop* affixt to that *City* and *Diocese*. As for any other meaning of it, proportionable to that which we were faine to affixe to the former, I confesse my selfe ignorant what it can tend to, For it is as if they should say, not any *councell* of *Presbyters* was seated in more *Churches* than one. Which is as if they should say, no *one body* is in *severall* places. And I know no *Prelatist* that either *directly* or by *consequence* hath affirmed it is.

54. What remaines in the last *Paragraph* of this *Chapter*, is onely to state the *Question* betwixt us, which is all the while no more but this, whether *Tertullian and* Irenæus *that call* Polycarpe *and* Onesymus *Bishop of* Smyrna *and* Ephesus, *meane Bishops*, *διακριτικῶς in a peculiar sense, or in a generall phrase, as all* Presbyters *are called Bishops*. And this I acknowledge to be the *onely question* between us, and if Bishops doe signifie Bishops, I cannot doubt but the cause is by them adjudged on *our side*; And why it should not, they have, to conclude, onely this offer of *argument*, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* had all one name in the *Apostles* dayes, and long after in *Irenæus*'s time.

55. I am truly weary of the length of this *Chapter*, and cannot but by consent have some *compassion* on the Reader, and therefore I shall bring the matter to this short issue. This *reason* of theirs is no *reason*, unlesse the word *Bishop*, both in the *Apostles dayes* and long after *Irenæus*'s time, signified a *Presbyter* in our *moderne* notion; For if both ἐπίσκοπος and Πρεσβύτερος *Bishop* and *Elder* signified *Bishop* in our notion, this againe gives the cause to us from them. And upon these termes I am content to leave it, if ever they finde in *Irenæus* that *Episcopus* signifies a *Presbyter* in our *moderne* notion, I will confesse them Conquerours, but this they have not offered here to doe, and I have some moderate assurance they never will.

And so much for that *Chapter*.

Chap. II.

Of the equivalence of the words Bishop *and* Elder *in the New Testament.*

Section I.

Foure sorts of equivalence of these words proposed.

Num. 1. THe next place where I find my selfe call'd forth, is about the midst of their *seventh Chapter*, toward the bottom of *pag.92. Onely for the conclusion of this Discourse*, &c. For although in the former part of that *Chapter* they undertake to vindicate their *chiefe* proofes of *Scripture*, Act.20.17,28. *Phil.*1.1. 1 *Tim.*3. 1 *Pet.*5. and to make replies to the *Answers* given to them, and although it is most certaine that in the *Dissertations* every of those places are answered, and shew'd to be fully reconcileable with our *pretensions* for *Prelacy*, yet they have not pleased to take any notice of what is there said, which if they had done, I might, without insolence, undertake to shew, that it had prevented all appearance of force in any of their *Replies*; And therefore being by this meanes perfectly freed from all obligation to view any *Paragraph* of that former part of the *Chapter*, and having already said somewhat to the chiefe of their places, *Act.*20. and fore-seeing a fit opportunity for the rest, I shall for mine own, and the *Readers* ease, punctually expect and obey the summons, appeare when I am call'd before them, but no sooner, avert their *charge*, and not multiply debates above what is *necessary*.

2. Thus then they begin, that *there is a Doctor, a high Prelatist*, &c. *That in a late Booke of his hath undertaken to make out these two great Paradoxes*, 1. *That whersoever the word Bishop is used in the New Testament, it is to be taken in a prelaticall sense.* 2. *That whersoever the word Presbyter is used in the New Testament, it is to be understood, not of a mere* Presbyter, *but of a Bishop properly so called. And whereas we say that the Scripture-Bishop is nothing else but a* Presbyter, *and that there was no* Bishops *distinct from* Presbyters *in the Apostles*

poſtles dayes, this Author on the contrary ſaith, that the Scripture-Preſbyter is a true Biſhop, and that there were no ſingle and meere Preſbyters in the Apoſtles dayes. For our parts we do not thinke it neceſſary to take a particular ſurvey of all that is ſaid in juſtification of theſe Paradoxes, onely we deſire it may be conſidered.

There is ſo much of the ſenſe of ſome paſſages in the *Diſſertations* ſet downe in theſe words, that I am forced to believe, that I am the *Author* here charged for theſe two *Paradoxes*. That they are ſo ſtyled by thoſe who are contrary minded, and who have aſſumed a power, which, if either of theſe *propoſitions* be true, they muſt be obliged to part with, I cannot thinke ſtrange; And if I ſhould ſtyle their *aſſertions* as perfectly *Paradox* (i.e. as *contrary* to all the *antients* ſenſe or *Doctrine* in this matter) when they ſay that the *Scripture-Biſhop* is nothing elſe but a *Preſbyter*, &c. this were certainly an *introduction* fit to be *confronted* to theirs, as being equally *argumentative*. But becauſe this *verball* eloquence hath little of *efficacy* in it, and will never be a meanes of evincing the truth of our pretenſions, by affirming the contrary to be *errours* or *Paradoxes*, and becauſe what is affixt to me, is not intirely my ſenſe, though it recite it in ſome part, and approach neere to it, I ſhall here begin with a briefe relation of what is affirmed by the *Diſſertations* in this matter, and then inquire what is here produced to invalidate it. 3.

Diſſert. 4. c. 6. the method leading to the conſideration of the word [*Biſhop*] and [*Elder*] in the *Scripture*, the firſt thing taken notice of was the ἰσοδυναμία or *equivalence* of theſe words in the opinion of many. To which purpoſe *Theodoret*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Oecumenius*, and St *Hierome* are cited, as favourers of this opinion, but this with ſome difference of the one from the other. And for the diſtinct ſtating of the *Queſtion*, foure ſenſes were ſet downe, wherein it was poſſible that this *equivalence* of the words might be underſtood. 1. That both *Biſhop* and *Elder* ſhould ſignifie one and the ſame, *viz.* a *Biſhop* in our *moderne* notion. 2. That both ſhould ſignifie the ſame thing, *viz.* a *Presbyter*. 3. That both of 4.

them should signifie promiscuously, sometimes a *Bishop*, sometimes a *Presbyter*, i. e. that the word Ἐπίσκοπος should sometime signifie a *Bishop*, sometime a *Presbyter*, and in like manner Πρεσβύτερος signifie sometime a *Bishop*, sometime a *Presbyter*. 4. That the word *Bishop* should alwayes signifie a *singular Bishop*, and the word *Elder* sometimes a *Bishop*, and sometimes a *Presbyter*.

5. Of these *foure* senses of the *equivalence* of these words, it was sure no error to conclude, that they were not all of them true, each being *exclusive* of the other three; and although some of the *antients* might be brought in favour to one, more than to the other, yet this was eminently observable, that those that favoured that *species*, which is most for the *Presbyterians* interest to be accepted, doe yet assert the cause of the *Prelatists* as confidently as any. So *Theodoret*, who seemes most to assert the *second species*, doth yet propugne the μείζων τιμὴ, the *superiour dignity* of *Bishops* above *Presbyters*, and affirmes * Those who were in his time called *Bishops* (the *Singular præfects* of *Cities*) to have been styled Apostles in the *Scripture*-times, and that *Epaphroditus* was called so by St. *Paul*, as being *Bishop* of the *Philippians*, and so saith he, *Titus* was *Apostle* of the *Cretanes*, and *Timothy* of the *Asiaticks*.

* τὸς νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους Ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον, &c. *Theo.* in 1 *Tim.* 3. 1

6. So when *Chrysostome*, and *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius* approve of the third *species*, and affirmes Bishops to be called Presbyters (and Deacons also) and on the contrary Presbyters to be called Bishops, yet of each of them it is notorious, that they asserted the *superiority* of Bishops over Presbyters, not onely in their owne, but in the Apostles time. And to that purpose the *concession* and *testimony* of *Peter Moulin* was produced, that the *most famous Bishops of the antient Church, Chrysostome*, &c. *did not thinke it any diminution to their dignity that the words Bishop and Elder were at first conceived to be used in the same sense*, which observation being premised, and thereby the *Prelatists* pretensions competently secured, which soever of those senses should be accepted, so long as they that were authors of the *assertions* be permitted to give their owne *interpretation* of them; It was then,

In *Phil.* 1. and *Act.* 20. and 1 *Pet.* 5. 1.

Epist. 1. *ad Episc. Winton.*

I thought, perfectly *ſeaſonable* and ſafe to diſcuſſe the *queſtion* freely, and to ſet downe what to me appeared moſt *probable*, without *prejudice* to any other *diſſenter*, and upon thoſe termes, and not otherwiſe, theſe two *propoſitions* were offered to farther conſideration of *learned* men.

1. *That the word* Ἐπίσκοπος *in Scripture conſtantly ſignifie a ſingular Biſhop.* 7.

2. *That the word* Πρεσβύτερος *either conſtantly ſignifies a Biſhop alſo, or elſe commonly a Biſhop, and ſometime, but rarely, a Presbyter.*

Theſe are ſomewhat different from the *two paradoxes* affixt to me, And in theſe termes I ſhall now reſume them againe, and cleare them to be no *paradoxes*. And begin firſt with the former of them, concerning the word Ἐπίσκοπος *Biſhop*. And this is already done, 1. By conſidering the *originall* notation, and uſe in the *Old Teſtament*, of the word Ἐπίσκοπος, then by going over every place in the *New Teſtament*, where the word *Biſhop* is uſed. 8.

Section II.

Of the word Ἐπίσκοπος.

THe word Ἐπίσκοπος naturally ſignifying an *overſeer*, and uſed by *Ariſtides* for ἡγέμων the *Governour*, the ſame that *Juſtinian* calls Ἄρχων ἐπαρχιῶν ἢ Μητροπόλεως, *the Ruler of Provinces and Metropoles*, and by *Cicero ad Atticum* rendred *ſpeculator & cuſtos*, one that *lookes* to, and *guards* a *Province* (and ſo fitly ſtyled *Angel*, who is generally deemed to have thoſe two *Offices*, and is in the *Scripture* called an *eye*, and vulgarly a *guardian*) doth in the *Greeke* of the *Old Teſtament* ſometime render the *Hebrew* נגיד, which is common to *God*, *Lord*, *Angel*, and generally denotes *Dominion*; ſometimes ממנה a *Praefect* or *Commiſſary*, intruſted with the *adminiſtration* of ſome affaire, whether in *army*, as a *Commander*, *Numb.* 31. 14. in *Mechanicall* working, as a *Maſter-workeman*, 2 Chron. 34. 12. 17. in a *City*, a *Ruler* or *Prince*, Nehem. 11. 9. peculiarly the *chiefe* of the *Prieſts* v. 10 in the *Miniſtery* of the *Temple* as *Eleazar* (the *Ruler* of the *Levites*) Num. 1.

vites) *Num.*4.16. and lastly in the *House of the Lord*, the *Ruler* set over that, 2 *Kin.*11.18. And the result of all this is, that it generally signifies an *office* of *charge* and *dignity* and *power* and *superiority* over others, all one with ἐπισάτης, πρεσάτης, ἄρχων, κωμάρχης, τοπάρχης, which are all used to render the same word that Ἐπίσκοπ- doth, and so is most fitly qualified to signifie the like, *viz.* a *prefecture* in the *Christian Church* under the *New Testament*.

2. Accordingly there we finde it applied, 1. to *Christ* himselfe, the *Bishop of our soules*, who though he *ministred* to his *Disciples*, yet owned the title of *Lord* and *Master*, as that which from them belonged to him, *Joh.*13.13. Secondly, to the *Apostles Act.*1.20. And for all other places where it is used, it is evidently capable of a sense very agreeable to these premisses, being never once used in the *New Testament*, but where it will be very commodious to render it *Bishop* in our moderne notion of the word for a *singular prefect* in each *Church*, not a *collegue* in a *Presbytery*.

3. This is at large shew'd by a survey of every of those places; First, that of *Act.*20.28. where the *Apostle* takes leave, and exhorts the *Bishops* set over the *flock* by the *Holy Ghost*: They are there bid to *feed the Church of God*, i.e. the *Christians* of the severall Cities of *Asia*, or neer about *Ephesus*, as was in the *last* Chapter evidenced out of *Irenæus*, auditor to *Polycarpe* made *Bishop* of *Smyrna* by St. *John*, and therefore may well be resolved to be the *singular Bishops* of those Cities, and not onely of the one City of *Ephesus*, as was largely shewed in the *last* Chapter.

4. The *second* place is that of *Phil.*1.1. where after the mention of all the *Saints in* Christ Jesus *which are at* Philippi, *is added, with the Bishops and Deacons*; where although some of the *Greeke Commentators*, which at the same time assert *Episcopacy*, do for that very reason, because there could not be *many Bishops* in one City, understand that place of *Presbyters* in our moderne notion, and adde that the words * *Bishop* and

* εἶπε τὲς πρεσβυτέρους, ὡ γὰρ δὲ ἐν μία πόλει πόλλοι ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι, ὅπω γὰρ ἦσαν διακεκριμένα τὰ ὀνόματα, *Theophyl.* in *Phil.*1.1.

Pres-

Presbyter, yea and *Deacon* too, were not as yet distinct, but promiscuously used, the one for the other; here the word *Bishops* for *Presbyters*, as elsewhere the *Presbytery* is used for *Bishops*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. adding this reason *, because *Presbyters* ordeined not a *Bishop*; And although many expedients were ready at hand to keepe the *Text* from being usefull to the *Presbyterians*, in case it were granted that by *Bishops* the *Presbyters* were meant, as that *Epaphroditus* their present *Bishop* (as is acknowledged by *Theodoret*, *Chrysostome* and *Theophylact*, who are most favourable to that interpretation) was with St. *Paul* at the writing that *Epistle*, c. 4. 18. yet I have the authority of *Epiphanius* to affirme, that ἐπίσκοποι there signifies peculiarly *Bishops*, and I doubt not but it may doe so, referring it to all the *Bishops* of the *severall* Cities belonging to that *Metropolis*.

* οὐ γὰρ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειρατόνουν.

For such was *Philippi*, both as the *first-fruits* of all *Macedonia*, first converted to the *Faith*, *Act.* 16. 9. & πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, *a prime City of that Province of Macedon*, v. 12. of it selfe, before it's *conversion*, and so saith * *Photius* distinctly, Ἡ Φιλίππων πόλις τῆς Μακεδόνων ἐπαρχίας μητρόπολις οὖσα, and accordingly *Polycarps Epistle* to them is inscribed τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικούσῃ Φιλίπποις to the whole *province* that belongs to *Philippi*; In which there being diverse Cities, and *Bishops* in them, the *Epistle* to St. *Paul* is to be conceived written to them all, (as the *Epistle* to the *Corinthians* appeares to have been written to the Saints of all *Achaia*) and being inscribed to *Philippi*, was to be communicated to those others, as the *Epistle* to the *Colossians* was to be communicated to the *Laodicæans*, Col. 4. 16. and that which the *Laodicæans* had received (whether, as *Tertullian* seemes to believe, that to the *Ephesians*, or any other) in like manner to be communicated to the *Colossians*, and the *Epistle* of the *Church* of *Jerusalem* to the *Church* of *Antioch* did belong and was communicated to all the *Churches* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*. Act. 16. 4.

5.

* *Epist.* 247.

And then all that the immediate subjoyning of the *Deacons* in that place, will conclude, is onely this (which is farre from yeilding the *Presbyterians* any profit) that as

6.

* πήθους μὴ ὄντος οὐκ εὐγένθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καταστάθῆναι, καὶ ἠρκέθησαν ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ τόπον μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἄνευ δὲ διακόνου ἐπίσκοπον ἀδύνατον εἶναι. *l.* 1. *Contr. Aër.*

* *Epiphanius* saith, νέου ὄντος κηρύγματος, the *Churches* being but *newly* planted, there were not *Presbyters* as yet constituted among them, onely a *Bishop* with one *Deacon* or more in each City, in like manner as it was at *Jerusalem Act.* 6. where after *James*'s assumption to the *Bishoprick*, which the *Ecclesiasticall* writers tell us of, the *seven Deacons* are soone instituted, no *Presbyters* being created in the middle, betwixt the *Bishop* and them, that either *Scripture* or antient *Record* informe us of.

7. And † *Clemens*, *St.* Pauls *fellow Labourer*, mentions it as the generall practice, that the *Apostles preaching through Regions and Cities constituted their first fruits into* Bishops *and* Deacons *of those which should come in to the faith.*

† *Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Corinth.*

8. Thus farre is this from being a *forced* interpretation being perfectly regular, and conformable to what we read of those times, out of the *best* and antientest *Records* of them; And if in any circumstance we should be lyable to mistake, yet for the maine, the *Reader* will hardly thinke it possible, when he remembers this very *Church* of the *Philippians* to be one of those expressely named by *Tertullian*, among whom in his time, *Apostolorum Cathedræ suis adhuc locis præsidebantur*, *The Chaires of the* Apostles *were yet extant præsiding in their due places*, which concludes some *Bishop* or *singular præfect* to have succeeded the *Apostles* in this *Church* (as in those other, *Thessalonica*, &c.) and by *Theodoret*, whose authority is most used against us in this matter, to prove that the *Bishops* were *Presbyters* here, *Epaphroditus* is expresly affirmed to be that *Bishop*.

9. The next place is that of 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. *If any man desire the Office of a Bishop he coveteth a good worke: A Bishop therefore must be blamelesse*—where there is no reason of doubting, but the *Bishop* is the *singular præfect* or *Governour* of the *Church*; For the onely appearance of the contrary being againe (as in that to the *Philippians*) the *immediate* subjoyning of *Deacons* and their *qualifications*, *v.* 8. that presently vanisheth,

vanisheth, if againe we remember the observation of *Epiphanius*, which he had out of the most *antient Records*, and was found exactly conformable to the expresse words of *Clemens Romanus*, the contemporary of the *Apostles*, that at the beginning of the *Church* τὰ πληρώματα τῆς οἰκονομίας οὔπω λαβούσης, *before the government was compleate* in all the Offices, the *Apostles* and *Apostolicall* persons placed in the *Church* by them, such as *Timothy* to whom here he gives the directions, created no more but a *Bishop* and *Deacon* (one or more) in each *Church*, the present state of things neither *requiring* nor being well capable of any more, in respect of the *paucity* of the Christians to be governed or instructed, and of those which were fit to be made Presbyters.

And although *Theodoret* againe (with some few others) interpret the place of *Presbyters*, yet 'tis as evident, he doth it not to the disadvantage of *Bishops*, adding in the same place, that the *Bishops* especially should observe these Lawes ἅτε δὲ καὶ μείζωνος μεταλαχόντας τιμῆς, *as those which had atteined to a greater honour.* 10.

Meanewhile S. *Chrysostome* interprets it distinctly of**Bishops*, as I have done, and in that notion of *Bishops* which severs them from *Presbyters*, such as *governe in each City*, and addeth the qualifications to be such, as being spoken of *Bishops*, καὶ Πρεσβυτέροις ἁρμόττει, *doe agree to* Presbyters *also*. And accordingly *Theophylact* interprets it of the προεστῶι and ἄρχων, the President and Ruler, without any mention of Presbyters. 11.

*Ἐπισκόπων ἔδει πόλλων, καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν προηγησαμένων.

There remaines but one place, and that of the very same nature with this last, and must certainly be regulated by it, *Tit.* 1.7. *For a Bishop must be blamelesse, as the steward of God* (answerable to that notion of the word *Bishop* in the *Old Testament* for the *Ruler set over the House of the Lord*, 2 *Kin.* 11. 18. *i.e.* the *Steward*, to whom the Keyes of the *House* were committed, *Isa.* 22.22.) That this is the *singular Bishop* in *every City*, signified before v.5. by the Elders, which *Titus* was *left* in *Crete* to *constitute*, is the joynt affirmation of St. *Chrysostome*, *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* on those words of *v.*5. Elders *in every City*, Ἐπισκόπους οὕτως ἐνταῦθα φησί, 12.

ὡς ἡ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τιμόθεον, &c. *By* Elders *he there meanes* Biſhops, *as in the Epiſtle to* Timothy, *appointing them to be conſtituted in every city, for he would not have the whole Iſland adminiſtred by one, but that every city ſhould have it's proper Paſtor* (or *Biſhop*) that ſo the labour might be the *lighter*, and the care more *exact*. In *Crete* there were certainly many Cities, *Euſebius* mentions an *hundred*, of all which, * ſaith he, *Titus* was made *Biſhop* by St. *Paul*, that under him, ſaith † *Theodoret*, he might *ordeine Biſhops*: to which * *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophylact* adde τῷ κείσιν ἐπισκόπων, that he might have *power* to *judge* or *cenſure* thoſe *Biſhops*, as a *Metropolitan* and *Primate* over them.

* *L.* 3. *c.* 4.
† *Arg. Ep. ad Tit. In tit.*
1 *Hom* 1.
* τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κείσιν ἡ χειροτονίαν, *Arg. Ep.*

13. There is now no other place wherein the word *Biſhop* is uſed, and by this briefe view of theſe, I hope the firſt *propoſition* is competently reſcued from meriting the cenſure of *Paradox*, whether that ſignifie *novell* or *ſtrange*; this being ſo conformable both to the *nature* and uſe of the word, to the *tradition* of the *antient Church*, and the importance of each *Scripture*, where it is uſed, that *Biſhop* ſhould ſignifie ἴδιον ποιμένα, the *ſingular Paſtor* or *Governour* in each *City* or *Church*.

Section III.

Of the word Πρεσβύτερος *Elder.*

Num 1. NOw to the *ſecond propoſition*, which pretended not to ſo much *poſitiveneſſe*, but is ſet down in a greater *latitude* of defining, that the word πρεσβύτερος either *conſtantly* ſignifies a *Biſhop* alſo, or elſe *commonly* a *Biſhop*, though ſometimes, but moſt *rarely* a *Presbyter*. Of this I ſhall now need to *præmiſe* but theſe few things.

2. Firſt, that the nature of the word זָקֵן commonly rendred πρεσβύτερος *Elder* in the *Old Teſtament*, doth denote moſt *properly*, and ſignifie moſt *conſtantly* (as in all *Languages* the word is found vulgarly to doe) a *Ruler* or *Governour*. This is ſo largely deduced and demonſtrated in the *Annotation*

no

on *Act.* 11.30. that I ſhall not indeavour farther to manifeſt it.

Secondly, that as in ſome places of the *New Teſtament* the word is neceſſarily to be underſtood of *Biſhops*, ſo in every other place it is very fitly capable of that *interpretation*; This is againe ſo particularly evidenced to the *Latine Reader*, *Diſſ.* 4.*c.*19,20,21,22. and to the *Engliſh* Reader *Annot.* on *Act.* 11. b. and 14.a. that I cannot deeme it reaſonable to tire my ſelfe farther with tranſcribing it. 3.

Thirdly, that if any one or more places ſhall be thought by any man to belong to *Presbyters* in our moderne ſenſe, as that of *Jam* 5. 14. or the like, I ſhall onely deſire, that he will bring any convincing proofe or *authentick Teſtimony*, that in that or thoſe places it ſo ſignifies, and I ſhall moſt willingly grant it to him, and be ſo farre from thinking it, in the leaſt degree, diſadvantagious to our pretenſions, that I ſhall not doubt to evidence it a *demonſtrative* argument to confirm them, but ſhall not need to inſiſt on that, till ſuch proofe be offered. 4.

Fourthly, that by this it is already moſt evident, that my *aſſertion* was not truely cited p.92. in theſe words, that *whereſoever the word* Presbyter *is uſed in the New Teſtament, it is to be underſtood not of a meere* Presbyter, *but of a* Biſhop *properly ſo called*; Certainly neither my words nor ſenſe extended to the *whereſoever*—and, *it is to be*—being onely in a *diſjunctive* forme, *either conſtantly* ſo, or *ſometimes* but *rarely* otherwiſe. 5.

Fifthly, that if I were not miſreported, and the *Paradox* were as high and as *poſitive*, as it is repreſented, yet I conceive not the reaſon why they that have with great *confidence* affirmed that both *Biſhops* and *Elders* do alway ſignifie in *Scripture* their *Presbyters* and no more, (for if either of thoſe words do but once ſignifie a *Biſhop*, their *Jus Divinum*, and whole cauſe falls to the ground irrecoverably) ſhould be ſo much at leiſure from *excuſing* themſelves, to *accuſe* that for a *Paradox* in others, which is not imaginable to be more an *extreme* on one ſide, then theirs is on the other. 6.

7. Laſtly, that if they *doe not thinke it neceſſary to take a particular ſurvey of all that is ſaid in juſtification of theſe* (which they thus pleaſe to ſtyle) *Paradoxes*, which is in effect, as if they ſhould profeſſe to *deny* and declaime againſt the *concluſion*, without attempting to ſatisfie any *reaſon*, by which it is inferr'd; It might be as juſt in me to tender them *anſwers* of the ſame making, and ſo to ſuperſede any farther diſpute in this matter.

8. But I ſhall not *imitate* their method, but rather prepare to attend them in it, and having thus farre ſerved them, by undertaking the taske which was *due* to *them*, in giving the *Reader* a briefe view of the grounds of my Aſſertions, which were *too long* for them to *take notice* of, I ſhall now trace their ſteps, and follow them which way ſoever they lead.

Section IV.

Of Reverence to Antiquity, and the Interpretations of the Antients. Of Prælatiſts diſagreement among themſelves.

Num. 1. FIrſt then, ſay they, *we deſire it may be conſidered, that theſe aſſertions are contrary to antiquity, which yet notwithſtanding our Brethren doe ſo highly magnifie and boaſt of it in this controverſy, and for receding from which, as they ſay we do, they doe moſt deeply charge us.*

2. That theſe *Aſſertions*, as farre as they are owned by me, and are *Aſſertions*, are ſo diſtant from being *contrary* to *antiquity*, that they are founded in the *Records* of the moſt *antient reverend authority*, hath appeared moſt plainly by what hath now been ſaid, and had before been laid, as the *ground* of the interpretations, in the fourth *Diſſert.* if they, which gathered the *concluſion* from thence, would have vouchſafed to take notice of the *præmiſſes*.

3. The utmoſt that can be with truth pretended, is, that ſome of the *Texts*, which we have inſiſted on here, and ſo likewiſe ſome of thoſe where πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* are mentioned, are not

not by all the *antients* interpreted juſt in that manner, as I thinke they may ſafely and moſt probably be *interpreted*, and ſo as they will beſt accord with the opinions which thoſe very *antients* appeared to have concerning the *Originall* of *Epiſcopacy*.

In this I hope I have not offended againſt the *antient Church*, or if I had, as I ſhould have expected other *accuſers*, than thoſe I have, ſo ſhould I waite for no other *judge* but my ſelfe, and immediately ſubmit to any *penance* for it. 4.

But they which truely *reverence antiquity*, diſcerne alſo wherein this *Reverence* is terminated, not in *adhering* to every *interpretation* of each *Text* of *Scripture* given by any *antient Commentator* or *Interpreter*, for truely that is abſolutely *impoſſible*, ſeverall of them being known in *interpreting* of *Texts* very frequently to differ one from the other; This can be no newes to any man, who hath but lightly viewed them, or but *occaſionally* conſulted *Tirinus*, or ſuch like later *Commentators*, who have *collected* the *Interpretations* of the *Antients*, and *marſhalled* their names, and told us how many have been for *one*, how many for *another* ſenſe of ſuch a *Text*. 5.

And in affaires of this nature, wherein they have neither taught *Doctrines*, nor teſtified *Traditions*, but onely expreſt their ſingle *opinions*, or *conjectures* of an *Apoſtles* meaning in words capable of more ſenſes than one, I know no *Prælatiſt* that ever denyed later Writers *liberty* to recede from *one*, and adhere to ſome other of the *antients*, or if more convincing reaſons appeared for any *freſh* interpretation, never given before, the like liberty hath been *allowed*; And indeed if it were not ſo, our *ſtudying* of the *Originalls*, inquiry into the nature of *words* and *phraſes*, obſervation of *cuſtomes* among the *antients*, and all wherein *learned* men differ from *unlearned*, conſideration of the *context* and *argument*, τὸ λογικὸν as well as τὸ ῥητὸν of each *difficult* place, and all the other skills and advantages of a good *Interpreter* would all be *unuſefull* firſt, and then *dangerous*, would tempt one oft to recede from ſome *former* Writers, to forſake the roade and 6.

method

method (ſo ordinary) of *tranſcribing* other mens labours, and by inciting him to ſay any thing which had not oft been ſaid before, (which if it have, why doth he againe trouble himſelf and others to *repeat* it) would infallibly involve him under the *burthen* and *guilt* that is here laid on me, of being *contrary* to *Antiquity*.

7. But I am unwilling to diſcourage them from any ſort or degree of *reverence* to *antiquity*, and on condition they will be fairely tried by it in any notion by which they can imagine to define that *Reverence*, or the word *Antiquity*, I will forgoe all my novell *interpretations*, and ſay no one word which the *Antients* have not diſtinctly ſaid before me, and refer the whole *fate* of the cauſe to this *judicature*.

8. Their *ſecond conſideration is*, that *they are contrary to all that have ever written in defence of Epiſcopacy, from whence they conclude that till their brethren* (i.e we *Pralatiſts*) *agree among themſelves, they need not ſpend time to anſwer the private Opinions of one Doctor*.

9. To this I anſwer, that it hath alwayes been deemed lawfull to any man, which hath undertaken the *defence* of a *Chriſtian cauſe*, aſſerted conſtantly by the *Church*, to chooſe his *arguments* (as *combatants* do their *weapons*) ſuch as he thinkes are fitteſt for his *managery*, and will moſt probably (in his opinion) convince the *gainſayers*; No obligation lying upon him by the *Lawes* of theſe *agones*, to uſe thoſe *arguments* (and no other, nor otherwiſe improved), which *all* other writers of that ſide have done before him; For if this were the manner of the νομιμὸς ἄθλησις the *legall combate*, to what end ſhould any *ſecond* writing on the ſame ſubject ever appeare to the World? That which had been formerly ſaid, needed not to be tranſcribed and ſaid againe, but either the booke might be *Re-printed* or tranſlated into a language more intelligible (as I have here been faine oft to doe) And though I might truly ſay, that for thoſe more minute *conſiderations* or *conjectures*, wherein this *Doctor* differs from ſome others, who have written *before* him (as to the manner of *interpreting* ſome few *Texts*) he hath the *ſuffrages* of many the *learneſt* men of this *Church* at this day (and as farre

as

as he knowes, of all that imbrace the ſame cauſe with him) yet I doe not thinke it neceſſary to prove my *agreement* with others of my *brethren* by this *onely medium*; It being certaine that they who believe the ſame *concluſion* upon ſeverall *mediums* or wayes of *inferring* it, are in that, and may be in all other *concluſions* at perfect accord and *unity* among themſelves.

All that I can conclude from this and the former *conſideration* (the double charge laid on me of *contrariety* to *antiquity*, and other *aſſerters* of *Epiſcopacy*) is onely this, that the *authors* of them are ill pleaſed, that I uſe any other *arguments*, or *anſwers* but what they were willing to *aſſigne* me: otherwiſe if there had been *leſſe*, not *more truth*, or *evidence* in my way of *defending* the cauſe, they would have had the greater *advantage* againſt me, and I doubt not, have been, in the ſpace of three yeares, at leiſure to have *obſerved* it. 10.

Section V.

Inconveniencies objected, and anſwer'd. Of more Biſhops in one City, No Preſbyters in the Apoſtles dayes. The no Divine right of the Order of Preſbyters.

BUt they are, in the *third* place, pleaſed to object ſome *inconveniences which the defending of theſe paradoxes muſt neceſſarily bring upon me*; And to theſe I ſhall more diligently attend. Num. 1.

Firſt, ſay they, *he that will defend theſe Paradoxes muſt of neceſſity be forced to grant that there were more* Biſhops *than one in a City in the* Apoſtles *dayes, which is to betray the cauſe of Epiſcopacy, and to bring downe a* Biſhop *to the ranke of a* Presbyter. 2.

To this I reply by abſolute *denying* of this *conſequence* (for ſuppoſing the *Scripture-Biſhop* to be alwayes a *Biſhop*, and ſo the *Scripture Elder* alſo, how can it follow from thence that there are more ſuch *Biſhops* in any *one City*?) 'Tis moſt evident that this is no way inferr'd upon either, or both of 3.

my *assertions*, nor is here one word added to prove it is, to which I might accommodate any *answer*. Tis on the contrary most manifest, that whensoever I find mention of *Bishops* or *Elders* in the *plurall*, as *Act.*20. *Phil.*1.&c. I interpret them of the *Bishops* of *Asia*, and the *Bishops* of *Macedonia*, *Bishops* of *Judea*,&c. (and render my reasons of doing so) and consequently affirme them to be the *Bishops* of divers (sure that is not of *one*) Cities.

4. The second inconvenience is, *that I must be forced to grant that there were no* Bishops *over* Presbyters *in the* Apostles *days, for if there were no* Presbyters, *there could be no* Bishops *over* Presbyters.

5. Here is an evident mistake, for I no where say, that there were no *Presbyters* in the *Apostles* dayes, but onely that in the *Apostles writings* the word [*Bishops*] alwayes signifies *Bishops*, and the word [*Elders*] either never, or but rarely, *Presbyters*; Now besides that it is possible for those to be in the *time* of the *Apostles* writing, which yet for want of occasion are not mentioned in those writings (and I that love not negative arguments *à testimonio*, should never have thought fit to conclude there were no *Presbyters* within the time wherein the severall Bookes of Scripture were written, upon that one argument, becaufe I could not find them mentioned there) besides this, I say, Tis certaine that the *Apostles* times are somewhat a larger period than the time of the *Apostles* writings, and therefore that what is spoken onely of the later, was not meant to be extended to the former.

6. For 1. the *Apostles* continued alive some time after writing their *Epistles*, and secondly, some of the *Apostles* survived others; *John*, of whom *Christs* will was intimated, that he should *tarry*, and not *die* till after the *comming* of *Christ*, and that *Kingdom* of his, commenced in the *destruction* of the *Jews*, did accordingly live till *Trajanes* time, and by that time I thinke it probable that the number of *believers* daily increasing, there were, as the wants of the *Church* required, *Presbyters* ordained in many *Churches*: And accordingly in the *Disser.*p.229. when I speak of this matter, I expressly except

except S. *John*, and *p.*211. I make use of a testimony of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, on purpose to conclude that this *Apostle* ordein'd *Presbyters* in *Asia*, after his returne from the *Island*, to which he was banished, ὅπου μοὶ ὁπισκόπους καθισήσων, ὅπου ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ὁρμόσων, &c. and to the same matter I * elsewhere apply that of *Ephiphanius*, out of the *profoundest*, i.e. *antientest Records*, that as *Moses* and *Aaron* tooke to them first the *Princes* of the *people*, and at length the *Sanhedrim* of the *seventy Elders*, so the *Apostles first constituted Bishops*, and in processe of time *Presbyters* also, when occasion required, as the *Bishops assistants*, and *Councell*, and that upon account of this *Analogy* with the *Sanhedrim*, they were styled πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*

* *Dissert* 4. c. 4. Sect. 4, 5.

7. And *Ignatius* making mention of *Presbyters*, as of a *middle* degree in the *Church* betwixt *Bishops* and *Deacons* in his, *i.e.* in *Trajan's* time, and that in his *Epistles* to severall of those *Asian* Churches, *Smyrna*, *Ephesus*, *Magnesia*, *Philadelphia*, *Trallis*, I thinke the argument of great validity to conclude, that in that *Province* that *Apostle* had in his life time instituted this *middle* order. And therefore I that had so carefully *prevented*, was not to be charged with this *crime* of *affirming* there were no *Presbyters*, or *Bishops* over *Presbyters* (which certainly there were, if there were *Presbyters* under them) in the *Apostles* dayes.

8. And *third* inconvenience they adde, that *by consequence I must affirme that* Ordo Presbyteratus *is not* Jure Divino.

9. But that is no more *consequent* to my *assertion*, than it was my *assertion*, that there were no *Presbyters* in the Apostles dayes, and therefore I that am guiltlesse of the *assertion*, cannot be charged with the consequents of it; *John* I know was an *Apostle*, and *John*, I believe, ordained *Presbyters*, and thence I doubt not to conclude the *Apostolicall institution*, i.e. in effect, the *Divine right* of the *order* of *Presbyters*, though not of the *government* of the *Church* by *Presbytery*; and so I am still cleare from the *guilt* of that *crime* which the *worst of Papists would abhominate*, which they are resolved I must have layen under, if I had questioned the *Divine Right* of *Presbyters*, though they can more than *question* the *Divine*

13. *Right* of *Biſhops*, and never have *remorſe* or *compunction*, or dread any *charge* or ſentence for it.

Sect. VI.

A firſt confeſſion objected and vindicated. Of the Epheſine Presbyters *being all the* Prælates *of* Aſia, Elders, Aldermanni.

Num. 1. AFter theſe *inconveniences* briefly touched (and almoſt as briefly by me averted) they proceede to take notice in the fourth place, of ſome *confeſſions* of mine, *which the juſtification of my opinion have forced from me*. By this method thinking (as at length they ſay) *to render Epiſcopacy*, that is thus maintained, or elſe my way of maintaining it, *odious and contemptible to all ſober, and godly, and moderate Chriſtians*, i.e. to all thoſe, who for the attaining of thoſe titles, good *opinion*, and good *words* from them, ſhall be invited to *contemne*, or *hate* thoſe, whom they are yet pleaſed to call their *brethren*. And this I confeſſe is the moſt compendious way of *confuting* that which would not otherwiſe be *confuted*.

2. What thoſe *confeſſions* of mine are, which are like to render my *aſſertions* ſo *odious*, I muſt next take a view, and conſider with what *juſtice* this is ſaid by them.

3. The firſt is, *that the Epheſine* Presbyters, *whom* Paul *ſent for to* Miletus, *were all the* Prælates *of Aſia*.

4. To ſay that the *Epheſine Presbyters*, in their ſenſe of the phraſe, are *Prælates* of *Aſia*, were, I confeſſe, a *ridiculous*, and ſo, if they pleaſe, a *contemptible confeſſion*, but I have yet been under no ſuch *torture* from their *arguments*, as ſhould conſtrain ſuch *confeſſion* from mee. What I ſay is ſufficiently known to be my free *opinion*, (and no *forced confeſſion*, ſuch as the *neceſſity* of a *deſperate* enterpriſe might extort from me) that the Πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *Elders of the Church*, who by ſummons ſent to *Epheſus*, the *chiefe Metropolis* of all *Aſia* (and by that convenient way communicated to other Cities) were aſſembled to *Paul* at *Miletus*, *Act.* 20. 17. were, as *Irenæus* aſſures mee, the *Biſhops* of the other Cities

Cities in thoſe parts, and not only of the one City of *Epheſus*.

What harſhneſſe there can be in this *aſſertion*, to be rejected as *odious* at the firſt hearing, I confeſſe I divine not, That thoſe Cities had *Biſhops*, as well as *Epheſus*, cannot be ſtrange, or that *Paul* deſired to ſpeake with them before his *finall* parting. And that the *Biſhops* may be called *Elders*, will be as little *ſtrange*, if it be but remembred, what is at large ſhewed in the *Diſſertations*, that the word *Elder* had in the *Old Teſtament* denoted *dignity* and *Præfecture* in *ſingle* perſons, as when *Eleezer Abraham's Oeconomus*, who was *ſet over* his *ſervants*, is ſtyled πρεσβύτερος τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄρχων πάντων τῶν αὐτοῦ, *the Elder of his houſe, and Ruler of all that was his* (by *Elder* and *Ruler* ſignifying the ſame thing) and ſo the *Elders* πρεσβύτεροι, of the *Moabites*, Num. 22.7. are the *Princes* of *Moab*, v. 8. and the *Elders* of *Iſrael* are the heads, or *Præfects* of the *principall Families* of *Iſrael*, Exod 6. 14. the *Rulers of the people* c. 16. 22. the *Elders* of the *Tribes*, *Deut.* 31. 28. and all this, and much more, before they were called into a *Councell*, or *Senate*, to aſſiſt *Moſes*, as appeares *Num* 11. 16. 5.

And proportionable to this hath been the uſe of the word among all Nations, ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἀεὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχει, καὶ τούτῳ πάντες πείθονται, *the Elder alwayes hath the Rule, and all obey him*, ſaith * Diodorus Siculus, and ſo *Seniors*] in all languages is a *title* of *honour* and *dignity*. 6. * *L.* 2.

And peculiarly among us, as when *Æthelſtane* the *halfe King* (as he was called) of the *Eaſt Angles*, was ſaluted by the title of * *Aldermannus*, i.e. Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder of all England*, and ſo *Æthelwod* and *Ælwin*, ſo in King *Ælfred's* Lawes c. 34. there is mention *Regis Aldermanni* and *Preſbyteri Regis*; And accordingly *Mat.* 20. 25. thoſe words of the *Princes of the Nations exerciſing dominion over them*, are by the *Saxons* interpreted Ealdormen pealdaþ hira deodo, *Elders have dominion over their Nations*, and *Luke* 9. 22. the *Elders and chief of the Prieſts* are by them rendred Ealdorum and Ealdormannum. All taking the word *Elder* for a title of *Dignity* and *præfecture* (and from that notion of it the *Presbyterians* are not obſerved to decline.) 7. * *Vid. Author. lib. Rames. Sect.* 4. and 33. and *S. Hen. Spelmans Gloſſary. p.* 28. 29.

And then finally that the addition of τῆς ἐκκλησίας the 8.

Church, though in the *singular*, cannot make it unfit for these *Elders* to denote the *Bishops* of *Asia*, or neere *Ephesus* under that *Metroplis*, hath been already accounted for at large. And so still I hope they, and all *godly and moderate brethren* need neither *hate*, nor *contemne Episcopacy*, nor the defenders of it, upon pretense of this (so farre from *incommodious* or *inconvenient*) *confession*.

Section VII.

A second confession of the Bishops, Phil. 1. 1. *being* Bishops *of that whole Province*, Philippi *a* Metropolis, *and a Colony*.

Num. 1. Like unto this first, is the second which they take notice of, *That the* Bishops *of* Philippi, *whom S.* Paul *salutes* Ch. 1. *were not the* Bishops *of that City onely, but of the whole Province, whereas* Theophylact *saith that* Philippi *was* μικρὰ πόλις ὑπὸ μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης τελοῦσα, *a little City subject to the* Metropolis *of* Thessalonica.

2. That the word Ἐπίσκοποι *Bishops*, Phil. 1. 1. denotes the *Bishops* of the Cities of *Macedonia*, which were under this πρώτη πόλις, chiefe City, or *Metropolis*, as S. *Luke* calls it, Acts 16. 12. is already evidenced to be no strange or violent (I hope as little odious) *confession*. I neede not farther repeat, or inlarge on that, but beare in good part, whatsoever fate is decreed by them to attend that *Confession*.

3. As for the *Objection* which is here subjoyned, and to which they were directed by *Differt.* 4. c. 10. Sect. 12. they might, if they had been so pleased, have taken the *antidote* with the *poyson*, observed, and tendred to the Reader the *answer*, which in the five following Sections is solemnely rendred to it, and confuted that *answer*, if they had discernd any *infirme* part in it.

4. First then, the *answer* is, that that *description* of *Philippi* in the *argument* prefixt to *Theophylact's* notes on that *Epistle*, was taken out of an *antient Geographer*, and belonged to that *City*

City, as it was built by *Philip*, having been formerly called Κρηνίδες, then Δαῖον: not to the *later* times, under the *Romane Empire*, and that it is no new, or ſtrange thing, that under the *Romans* thoſe Cities ſhould become *Metropoles*, which formerly had not been ſuch, to which agrees that of the *Councell of Chalcedon*, *Can.* 12. which mentions, πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν καὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐνόμασε τιμηθείσας *Cities honoured by the imperiall Letters with the name* and dignity *of Metropoles*.

And indeed the ſaying of * *Strabo* is of evident truth, ordinarily experimented, that *Provinces* were often confounded διὰ τὸ τὰς Ρωμαίους μὴ καλὰ φύλα διελεῖν αὐτὰς, ἀλλ' ἕτερον τρόπον διαλάξαι διοικήσεις, ἐν αἷς ἀγορεύειν ποιοῦνται, *by cauſe of the* Romans *diſtributing them not according* to the diſtributions of Regions or Nations (ſuch as the *Geographers antiently* had made uſe of) *but after another manner, according to the* Cities, *in which they kept their Courts* or *Aſſiſes*, as before was ſaid of the Cities of *Aſia*. 5. * *Geogr.* l. 13.

Accordingly when S. *Paul* firſt comes to *Philippi*, St. *Luke* mentions it under the title of the *prime City* of the *Province* of *Macedonia*, and is not that more to be heeded, ſpeaking ſo expreſly of that *City* at that time, then that *Geographers* deſcription, which no way diſcovers to what time it belongs, and cannot belong to this time of the *planting* the *faith* at *Philippi*, if S. *Luke* may be believed? 6.

Secondly, the ſame St. *Luke* ſaith of it at that time, that it was κολωνία a *colony* of, i.e. a *City* repleniſhed by the *Inhabitation* of the *Romanes*; And of thoſe *Colonies* in chiefe Cities, there is no queſtion but they were eſpecially choſen to be places of their Aſſiſes, whither the *Neighbouring* Cities reſorted for *Juſtice*, and ſo were *Metropoles* in the *civill accounts*. 7.

Thirdly, of this City of *Philippi* 'tis as evident, that it was the firſt *converted* of all *Macedonia*, and that from thence he went after to *Theſſalonica*; And ſo the right of *Primogeniture*, which ordinarily gave claime to the *Metropoliticall* dignity in the *Eccleſiaſticall* account (as in the caſe of *Antioch* and *Jeruſalem* appeares) belonging to *Philippi*, over and above 8.

above the forementioned præcedence thereof in *civill account*, there is no reason to doubt, but this was a *Metropoliticall Church*, an Elder *Sister* to *Thessalonica*, and each a *Mother* to the *Churches* of lesser Cities of *Macedonia* that belonged to them.

9. According to which it is, that *Polycarpe* in his *Epistle*, mentions St. *Pauls* Epistles in the *plurall*, written to these *Philippians*, which learned men interpret of the Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, and it cannot commodiously be understood any other way.

Sect. VIII.

A third Confession, of Timothies *being an Archbishop. Of the qualifications,* 1 Tim. 3 2. *belonging to* Bishops. *Of the* Bishops *being worthy of double honour, though he never preach.* Of the word, and Doctrine. Of the Presbytery, 1 *Tim.* 4. *Of Rebuking and receiving accusation against an* Elder.

Num. 1. THe third *Confession* is, that *Timothy was* Archbishop *of* Ephesus, *that when* Paul *sets downe the qualifications of* Bishops, *though he mention none but such as are common to a* Presbyter *with a* Bishop, *yet he is to be understood to speake of* Bishops *in a Prelaticall sense, and not at all of* Presbyters; *And when he saith the* Elders *that Rule well are worthy of double honour—, this is, saith this Author, the* Bishops *that Rule well — thereby holding out this great errour, that a* Bishop *that Ruleth well is worthy of double honour, though he never preacheth; And when St.* Paul *bids* Timothy *not neglect the gift that was given him by the laying on the hands of the* Presbytery, *that is, saith he, of Episcopacy; And when the Apostle chargeth him not to rebuke an* Elder, *—and not to receive an accusation against an* Elder, *—this is to be understood of* Bishops, *saith he, and not of meere* Presbyters.

2. To this *accumulative* crime affirmed to be *confest* by me in so many particulars, I *answer* by avowing my *Confession* thus farre; 1. that I take *Timothy* to have been *Bishop* of

of *Epheſus*, and conclude it from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. then that *Epheſus* was a *prime Metropolis* of *Aſia*, from the teſtimonies of *Pliny* and *Ulpian*, and generally the *Antient Church*-writers: And from thoſe two put together, I hope I may gaine liberty to *confeſſe*, that *Timothy* was *Archbiſhop* of *Epheſus*.

Secondly, That *Paul* 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. ſpeaking of *Epiſcopacy*, as of a *good worke* or office, and the *qualifications* required in the perſon to be promoted to it, ſpeakes of a *Biſhop* in the *Prælaticall* ſenſe; ſo I am ſure *Chryſoſtome* doth underſtand him, and the *teſtimony* was lately cited out of him, and *Theodoret* that underſtands it otherwiſe, yet applies it firſt to *Biſhops*, and ſaith on that occaſion, that their degree in the *Church* is *ſuperior* to that of *Presbyters*. And if no higher qualifications be required of a *Biſhop*, than are fit to be required of a *Presbyter* (which yet I no where ſay, and the argument taken from the *no-other qualifications* here ſpecified, than onely for the *Biſhop* and the *Deacon*, are of no force to induce it, both becauſe it is a *negative argument*, and there is another reaſon for the omitting *Presbyters*, becauſe in this *infancie* of the *Church* there was not any ſuch need of them, the *Biſhop* with his *Deacon*, one or more, were ſufficient in every *City*, and beſides the *qualifications* aſſigned the *Deacon*, may be common to him with the *Presbyter*, as well as thoſe aſſign'd the *Biſhop*) yet that is no *prejudice* to the *ſuperiority* of the *office*, or to my interpreting that *Text* of the *Biſhop*; For ſure I may as conveniently ſay, that the *Biſhop* is named without the *Preſbyter*, at a time when there were *Biſhops*, but as yet no *Presbyters* in the *Church*, and that when there were *Presbyters* inſtituted, their *qualifications* were to be regulated by the *rules* given of *Biſhops*, as it can be imagined to be fitly ſaid by them, that the place is meant of *Preſbyters* (when the *Apoſtle* names *Biſhops* expreſly, and when by many other evidences we know, that then there were *Biſhops*, but by no footſteps can diſcerne that then there were *Preſbyters*) upon no other reaſon, but that the *qualifications* are common to *Preſbyters*. 3.

Thirdly, For the mention of the *Elders* that *rule well*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. I doubt not but it may very *commodiouſly* be inter- 4.

preted of the *Bishops* through all his *Province*, for as there the style is πρεσβύτες, *praeside* or *rule*, so 'tis certaine, that in the use of the *Church* this was the title of the *Bishops*, as hath formerly been shewed out of *Justin Martyr* and others, and the διπλὴ τιμὴ *double honor* כפי שנים the *priviledge* of *Primogeniture*, being assigned as his *portion*, is an evidence thereof.

5. And the *inconvenience* that is here urged against that *interpretation*, is perfectly of no force. For 1. if from hence it might be concluded that a *Bishop* is worthy of *double honour*, though he *never preacheth*, then from their interpreting it of the *Presbyter*, it will as much follow to be their *opinion*, that the *Presbyter* is *worthy of double honour* though he *never preach*.

6. But then secondly the truth is, that neither of these *conclusions* follow either the one or the other *interpration*, for the first phrase of *labouring in the word*, and the other of *labouring in the doctrine* (which by these are confounded, and so expreit *undistinctly* by *preaching*) denote *two* severall things; the *former* the *planting* of the *faith* where it is not yet *received*, which is constantly expreit by εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, κηρύσσειν, and λόγῳ, *preaching* the *Gospell*, and the *word*; the *latter* signifies taking *paines* in a *Church* already gathered, for the *confirming* and farther *instructing* of *believers*. And then as he that doth one of these, may yet possibly not doe both, occasion not requiring, and so not be so eminently *worthy* of the *double honour*, as he that actually doth both; so certainly, he that *rules well* in any *Church*, and beside the care belonging to *rule*, undergoes that other *double* hard *travell* (so κοπιῶν signifies) of *preaching* the *faith* to *Infidels*, and *confirming*, and *instructing believers*, doth very highly deserve the *double honour* and *alimonie*; And this as it is the exact meaning of that *Text*, so it utterly supersedes all force of this *objection* or *exception* against our understanding it of the *Presidents* or *Bishops* in the *Prælaticall* sense.

7. Fourthly, For the word *Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* 4.14. by which they say, I understand *Episcopacy*, I answer, that I interpret it of some *combination* either of *Apostles* or *Apostolical* persons and

Bi-

Biſhops, τῶν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς χάριτος ἀξιωμάτων in *Theodoret*'s phraſe, *ſuch as were vouchſafed the Apoſtolicall grace*, i. e. of *Paul* aſſuredly, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. and perhaps of *Barnabas*, perhaps of ſome other *Apoſtolical* perſon with him, in like manner as both *Peter* and *John* ſtyle themſelves πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, and * *Ignatius* ſtyles the *Apoſtles* πρεσβυτέριον ἐκκλησίας the *Preſbytery* or *Elderſhip of the Church*, and as of *Ignatius* himſelfe S. *Chryſoſtome* affirmes, μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρας, that the *hands* of more *Apoſtles* than one were *laid* on him, in his *ordination* to the *Biſhoprick* of *Antioch*. * Ep. ad Philad.

8. To which matter the *Scholion* of *Chryſoſtome* is expreſſe, οὐ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων φησὶ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἐπισκόπων, *he ſpeakes not here of Presbyters but Biſhops*, adding the reaſon, becauſe *Presbyters* did not *ordaine Biſhops*, and ſo *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*.

9. Laſtly for the other two places of *not-rebuking* and *receiving an accuſation againſt an Elder*, though in thoſe places it were clearely for my intereſt to interpret πρεσβύτερος a *Presbyter* in our moderne ſenſe, for then as * *Epiphanius* ſaith, there is an evidence of proofe that the *Biſhop hath power over the Presbyter* (ὅθεν ἡ πρεσβυτέρων ἐξουσίαν ἔχει) *Timothy over the Elder*, ſaith he, *but never the Elder over Timothy*: Yet I confeſſe my ſelfe inclined by other conſiderations to foregoe that *advantageous* ſenſe of the place. * Cont. Hær. l. 3. t. 1.

10. Becauſe *Timothy* being placed in the *prime Metropolis* had power over the *Biſhops* of leſſer *Cities*, and that, as hath oft been ſhewed, κείσιν as well as χειροτονίαν power of *judging* as well as of *ordeining Biſhops*, which is * elſewhere evidenced to be the opinion of S. *Chryſoſtome*, in order to the underſtanding of this place. And ſo ſtill the crime is not very great or reproachfull, which I am ſaid to have *confeſt*, it amounts no higher than the former *confeſſion* had done, that *Timothy* was *Archbiſhop* of *Epheſus*; and yet this you ſee without any neceſſity to extort it from thee, ſave that of ſpeaking *freely* what I conceived moſt *probable*; For otherwiſe nothing could be more for the advantage of the maine cauſe I defend, than that πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* ſhould ſignifie *Presbyters* in theſe *two* places. * *Diſſert.* 4. c. 19. *ſect.* 11, 12.

Sect. IX.

A fourth confession of Titus *being Archbishop of* Creet.

Num. 1. THeir *fourth* charge is, that I am *forced to confesse that* Titus *was* Archbishop *of* Creet, *and that he received no commission from S.* Paul *to ordaine single Elders, but onely for ordeining Bishops in every City. It seems*, say they, *this Author slights the Postscript, where* Titus *is called the first Bishop of* Creet, *and slights all those antient Fathers that are cited by his owne party, to prove that he was* Bishop *of* Creet: *But he must be an* Arch-Bishop, *and so must* Timothy *also, or else these assertions of his will fall to the ground. Now that they were neither* Bishops *nor* Arch-Bishops *hath beene sufficiently proved (as we conceive) in the former discourse.*

2. That *Titus* was *Arch-Bishop* of *Creet*, I confesse again that I cannot but believe, till I am shewed how the contrary were possible, *i.e.* how he that was fastned in (and, as * *Eusebius* faith, had ἐπισκοπὴ the *Episcopacy* of) a whole *Island*, which had an *hundred Cities* in it, and was there placed, that he might *ordeine Bishops* under him in each of those *Cities*, *Tit.* 1. 5. 7. and, as the *antients* adde, exercise *jurisdiction* over them, should be other than an *Arch-Bishop*.

* *Lib* 3. *c.* 4.

3. That this was his condition, hath been shewed already, And for the *inconveniences* that it is prest with, they will prove very *supportable*. For I shall not at all be obliged thereby to *slight* either *Postscript* or *Fathers*, but give the disputers example to pay them all *reverence*, being very well able to discerne the *Bishop* through the *Archbishop*, & having never imagined that the styling *Michael* an *Archangel* was denying him to be an *Angel*. He certainly was an *Angel*, and that of an *higher* degree, or else could never have been justly called an *Archangell*; and 'tis just so with *Titus*, if I had not thought him a *Bishop*, I could never have affirmed him an *Archbishop*, and they that in common speech give him the title of *Bishop*, doe no way intimate their thoughts to be *contrary* to mine, for every *Archbishop* is certainly a *Bishop*, though every *Bishop* be not an *Archbishop*.

And

And therefore if all the danger of my *aſſertions* falling to the ground be conſequent to this of *Titus* or *Timothies* proving to be no *Archbiſhop*, I ſhall deeme them competently ſafe, for each of them were unavoidably ſuch, *Timothy Archbiſhop* of *Epheſus*, the *prime Metropolis* of all *Aſia*, and *Titus* of the *whole Iſland* of *Creet*, and accordingly to thoſe two, peculiarly as ſuch, *directions* are given for the *ordeining Biſhops* and *Deacons* in every *City*. 4.

And the proofes which were offered to the *contrary*, have I ſuppoſe already been anſwered, and being not here thought fit to be recited, the *replyes* ſhall not be ſo impertinent, as to appeare without their *antagoniſts*. Onely becauſe it is here inſerted as part of my *inconvenient confeſſion*, that *Titus* received no *Commiſſion* from Saint *Paul* to *ordaine* ſingle *Elders* (which I believe I no where ſay, any otherwiſe than that the *Commiſſion*, cap. 1. 5. was to *create Biſhops* in *every City*) I ſhal freely tell them my opinion of that, *viz.* that a *greater* power may very fitly be ſaid to comprehend under it the *leſſer* of the ſame kinde, and conſequently that both *Timothy* and he which had *Commiſſions* to ordaine *Biſhops* in every *City*, had alſo by the ſame *commiſsion* power to ordaine *ſingle Presbyters*, where thoſe were uſefull to be *ordained*, as is evident by the *qualification* of *Deacons* and *Widows* after-mentioned in one certainly, and, as I conceive, in both *Epiſtles*, for that ſuppoſeth their *Commiſsion* to extend to the *ordeining* of thoſe, who yet had not been named in them, if we may gueſſe by that of *Titus*, cap. 1. 5. And ſo much alſo of that part of my *confeſsion*, which is as *free* and *unforced*, as the former had been, and I believe as ſafe to the *affirmer*. 5.

Sect. X.

A fift charge of contrariety to Scripture *answered. Of visitation of the sick, belonging to Elders,* James 5.

Num. 1. BUt the *fift* and *last* charge is more severe than any of the former, that these *paradoxes*, as they stile them, *are contrary to the very letter of the Scripture, as we have made it evident in our arguments against the* Jus Divinum *of Episcopacy, and would farther manifest it, if we thought it necessary.*

2. This I confesse of *contrariety to the very letter of the Scripture* (rightly understood) I lookt upon as so high a *charge*, that I verily expected somewhat *extraordinary* to binde it on me, and I suddenly resolved (as I read the first words of that *Section*) to examine those *Scriptures* that should now be produced, *ponderingly* and *exactly*, and either confesse my owne *conviction*, or give competent reasons why I was not *convinced* by them.

3. But I soon found my *expectation* frustrated, for as here is no one such *Scripture* mentioned, so for their *arguments against the* Jus Divinum *of Episcopacy*, I know not where to seek them, and never heard (and verily believe there is no such thing) that they had formerly written any such *Book* against *Bishops*, wherein the *Dissertations* or any *assertions* of mine therein, were so much as *arraign'd* by them, much lesse *evidenced* to be *contrary to the very letter of Scripture*: If I had, I assure them I should then have been as ready to have made my *reply*, as now I have been to attend them thus farre.

4. And for their evidencing this in any *tract* publisht by them before the *Dissertations* were written, by which notwithstanding the *Dissertations* were to be concluded, I have no reason to thinke that to be their meaning, because these *assertions* of mine are by them affirmed to be *Paradoxes*, contrary to all *that have ever written in defence of Episcopacy*, and therefore could not, unlesse it were by *divination*, be taken notice of, and prevented by them.

5. After they had expreſt their *opinion* that it was not *necessary* for

for them farther to *manifeſt* the *contrariety* of *my Paradoxes* to the *very letter* of the *Scripture*, they yet farther proceed in theſe words,

For when the Apoſtle ſaith, James 5. 14. *Is any man ſick among you let him call for the Elders of the Church—who is there that can be perſwaded to believe that all theſe Elders were Biſhops (in the ſenſe that Biſhops are taken in in our dayes) Is this the proper worke of Biſhops to viſit the ſick? And beſides, if the Apoſtle by Elders had meant Biſhops in that ſenſe, he would have ſaid, let him call for the Elders of the Churches, not of the Church, unleſſe our brethren will ſay that there were divers Biſhops in every Church in the Apoſtles dayes, in which there were many ſick perſons.*

What the [*For*] in the *front* here ſignifies, I ſhall not goe about to conjecture. The *antecedents* would incline me to believe that it pretends to introduce a *reaſon*, which might make it *evident* that my *aſſertions* are contrary to the *very letter* of *Scripture*: But that ſure it doth not any way attempt or appeare to doe, unleſſe the πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* of the *Church* be ſuppoſed here to ſignifie *Preſbyters* in our moderne notion of the word: But then that is ſo farre from being *granted*, that it is knowne to be the onely ζητούμενον, the matter of *queſtion* betwixt us all this while, and ſo was to be *proved* not *ſuppoſed* or *preſumed* in this matter. 6.

But bating them this *begging* of the *Queſtion*, I ſhall proceed to ſatisfie their *wonderment*, that I ſhould *goe about to perſwade* any, that πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, in this place of Saint *James*, were *Biſhops* in that ſenſe that we now underſtand and uſe the word. 7.

And 1. I ſhall not doubt to avow, that for all that ſpace, that in any *Church* there were no other *officers* ordained, but onely the *Biſhop* and *Deacon*, it muſt of neceſſity be reſolved the proper worke of *Biſhops* to *viſit the ſicke*. That there was at the firſt, when the *Faith* was but thin planted, ſuch a time hath already been evidenced out of *Clemens Romanus*, and the *profoundeſt antequities* that *Epiphanius* could meet with, And that then this *office* muſt either be neglected, or performed by either *Biſhop* or *Deacon*, will not need any farther proofe. 8.

As

9. As for the the *Deacons* in their *institution*, we finde not that to be any part of their *office*, and indeed the suitablenesse of *absolution* to that state of dangerous *sickness*, and the mention of καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἢ πεποιηκὼς his *having committed sins*, and the command of giving it (in case he be qualified for it) ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, *absolvetur ei, absolution shall be* given him, doth render the *Deacon* incompetent for that worke, and so, where there are no *Presbyters*, must needs divolve it on the *Bishop*.

10. And this account hath more than probability, no lesse than perfect evidence in it, if we onely suppose what hath been so oft cleared from the *Antients* to be matter of *fact*, that where the number of *believers* was small, and none qualified for the office of *Presbyters*, there the *Apostles* constituted no more but a *Bishop* and a *Deacon* in each City. For whilst this was the state of that City, I shall suppose a man *sick*, and by the force of S. *James*'s exhortation, desirous of *absolution*, &c. Who is there supposeable in that City to give it him but the *Bishop*? And whom else can he *call* to him for this purpose? And then who can doubt but this is the worke, in it selfe very *agreeable*, and in this supposed case *peculiar* and proper to the *Bishop*? so that unlesse this supposition be *false*, nay *impossible* to be true, I may safely say, this was or might be the *Bishops* worke, to *visit the sick*, &c.

11. And indeed, if it were not, how could it be by the *Bishop*, when other parts of his *office* became his fuller employment, *committed* to the *Presbyter*? For 1. he could not commit this to others, if he first had it not in *himselfe*; and Secondly, this was the onely reason of *ordaining* inferiour officers in the *Church*, that part of the *Bishop*'s taske might be performed by them (as when the whole burthen, which was too heavy for *Moses*, was distributed among other men) which in this particular could not be, if before this assignation of *assistents*, it were not *originally* the ἔργον *worke* or *proper* taske of the *Bishop*.

12. To this may be farther added the reall *dignity*, because necessary *charity* of this performance of *visiting* the *sick*, &c. and this arising both from the intimation of *Gods* owne *finger*, pointing

pointing out this a moſt agreeable ſeaſon for all *ſpirituall* admonition and *comfort*, a *molle tempus fandi*, wherein a word *ſeaſonably* ſpoken, may moſt probably find the due *reception*, and wherein the *prayers* and *bleſſing* of the moſt *Apoſtolical* perſon, or the moſt *highly* and juſtly dignified in the *Church*, & in the favour of *God*, may come in moſt *opportunely*, & in this reſpect we ſee in that place, that the *prayers* of the great *Prophet Elias* are made uſe of by S. *James*, to exemplifie the practice, which in this particular he recommended to the *Church*.

13. And I muſt needs tell the *Objectors*, that as meane an opinion as they ſeem to have of this work of *viſiting the ſick*, I cannot but *affirme* on the contrary, that if it were duely and advantagiouſly managed, it were *extreamely* uſefull and beneficiall to the good of *Soules*, and as proper for a *Biſhop perſonally* to performe, when his other publick *neceſſarie* taskes (wherein many more are concern'd, and wherein he hath no *proxies* to ſupply his place) permit, as any one part of his *divine office*, differing from the reſt only in this, (and in that reſpect yeilding the *precedence* to them) that other parts of his *office* are, or may be at the ſame time *extenſive* to *many*, whilſt each act of this is terminated in ſome *one*, whoſe *ſoul* yet ought to be more *pretious* in his eyes, than all other *acquiſitions* in the world.

14. Accordingly it is in the * *Diſſertations* evidenced out of *Polycarp's Epiſtle* (who was ſomewhat after the time of *James* the *author* of this *Epiſtle*) that part of the *Biſhop's office* it was then eſteemed to be, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι πάντας ἀδυνάτους, *to viſit all the ſick*, in like manner as in *Juſtin Martyr* he is made the *Curator of all that are in want*, the grand *diſtributer* of all the *liberalities* of the *Church*. * *Diſſert.* 4. 21, 22.

15. As for the onely *objection* that is here tendered againſt this *interpretation* of the place, from the *ſingular* [ἐκκλησίας *of the Church*] not of the *Churches*, the *anſwer* is obvious, that this *Epiſtle* of *James* being written to all the *Jewes* in *diſperſion*, *Jam.* 1. 1. theſe could not make up any one *particular Church* of any ſingle *denomination*, but yet all conjoyne very fitly in that one *Univerſal* ſtyle of ἐκκλησία, *the Church*. In this reſpect we know 'tis called the *Catholick Epiſtle* of *James*, becauſe written to the whole *Church* of the *Jewes*, all

the *believers* of that nation, whereſoever *diſperſt* out of their *Countrey*.

16. Now theſe inhabiting in *divers* Cities, it is as certaine there were divers *Biſhops* in this *circuit*, and ſo the πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *the Elders of the Church*, are moſt commodiouſly ſet to expreſſe theſe ſeverall *Biſhops*, belonging to this *complexe* body, the *Church* of the *diſperſion*.

17. Not that there were more of theſe in *one City*, for that conſideration would never have cauſed the *plural* expreſſion, becauſe were there never ſo *many*, the *ſick perſon* needed not have called *more* at once (and upon that ſcore I ſhall demand of them that argue from the *number*, was every *ſick* man in their opinion, to call for the whole *Preſbytery?*) nor againe becauſe there were not as many *Churches* as *Elders*, but onely becauſe theſe many *particular Churches*, of which there was an *equall* number of *Elders*, were very fitly comprehended under the one *general* ἐκκλησία, the *Church* in the ſingular number.

Sect. XI.

A laſt objection from Act. 21. 18. *and* 14. 3. and 11. 30. *anſwered.* Elders *for* Rulers *or* Biſhops.

Num. 1. THere yet remaines one ſort of *Objections* more againſt theſe *Paradoxes*, in theſe words.

Beſides, when it is ſaid, Act 21. 18. *Paul went in with us unto* James, *and all the Elders were preſent, It is ſuppoſed by our Epiſcopall men, that* James *was at this time Biſhop of* Jeruſalem. *Now we demand, who were theſe Elders? were theſe alſo Biſhops of* Jeruſalem? *Will this anſwer conſiſt with our brethrens judgement? ſo likewiſe when it is ſaid,* Act. 15. 4. *And when they were come to* Jeruſalem, *they were received of the Church, and of the Apoſtles and Elders, we demand, what is meant by the Church? Is it not meant the Church of* Jeruſalem, *to which place they are ſaid to come? And if ſo, then we aske further, what is meant by the Elders? Muſt it not be anſwered, that by Elders are meant the Elders of* Jeruſalem? *And then if any man aſke us, how theſe*

Elders

Elders can be ſaid to be Biſhops in a Prelatical ſenſe, eſpecially according to the ſenſe of our brethren, who make James *to be at this time the onely Biſhop of* Jeruſalem. *Adde further, It is ſaid,* Act. 14.3. *When* Paul *and* Barnabas *had ordained them Elders in every Church,* Act. 11.30. *They ſent reliefe to the Elders,* &c. *Can any imagine that this reliefe was ſent onely to Biſhops, and that* Paul *and* Barnabas *ordained no Presbyters in any Church, but only Biſhops? Is not this to offer manifeſt violence to the Scriptures? and inſtead of upholding of Epiſcopacie, is not this ſufficient to render it odious and contemptible to all ſober, and godly, and moderate Chriſtians? But we forbeare.*

It ſeems we have ſtill remaining another heape of *inconvenient Confeſſions* that we labour under; And upon them, *more ſocratico*, they make their demands; And although I might juſtly wonder why they which have reade the *Diſſertations*, and know what *anſwer* I give to every of their *demands*, ſhould be at the trouble to aske them againe, yet becauſe I am reſolved not to be weary of *attending* them, I ſhall *anſwer* them as punctually as they could wiſh, and patiently ſupport all the *odium* that will reſult from thence, among all *ſober, and godly, and moderate Chriſtians.* 2.

Here onely I deſire two things may be remembred, which have already been evidenced, 1. that the word πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, in the ſtyle of the *Old Teſtament*, in the continued uſe of all *languages*, being an expreſſion of *power* and *dignity*, is in the *New Teſtament* upon all reaſonable accounts as properly applicable to the *Rulers* and *Governours Eccleſiaſtical*, as the word *Apoſtles*, or *Biſhops*, or *Preſidents*, or *Rulers*, or any the like would be thought to be, and withall very fit to expreſſe *ſingle Rulers* in each particular *Church* (in caſe any ſuch may otherwiſe appeare to be mentioned in *Scripture*) there being no propriety in the *word*, or peculiarity in the *uſage* of it, to incline it to *joynt* power of *Collegues* ruling in *common*. 3.

Accordingly evidences have been produced in the *Diſſertations* to ſhew the continuance of this uſage among Authors after the *Scripture*-time, that it long remained in the *language* of the Antients, *Polycarpe*, *Papias*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, 4.

drinus and *Tertullian*, many of which are knowne and by the *adverſaries* acknowledged to aſſert *Epiſcopacy* in our moderne ſenſe, and yet uſe the word Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, to denote ſometimes the *Apoſtles*, ſometimes the *ſingular Biſhops* in *each Church*.

5. And therefore the affirming this one thing, ſo atteſted and confirmed, *viz.* that the word Πρεσβύτεροι may very conveniently be interpreted *Biſhops*, as oft as the circumſtances of the *Text* will beare it, will not, I hope, ſtill be ſo *unfortunate* as to fall under the *cenſure* of *Paradoxe* and *odious*, being indeed a plaine obvious obſervation, which hath nothing of difficulty or *harſhneſſe* in it.

6. Having præmiſed this, I ſhall onely adde, that the *Apoſtles* being by all *Prælatiſts* (I hope convincingly) affirmed and proved to have *ordeined Biſhops* in every *City* of *Converts* and *proſelites* to the *Faith*, and there being many ſuch *Cities* in *Iudæa*, beſides *Ieruſalem*, and conſequently many *Biſhops* in thoſe *Cities*, one in each, it can be no new thing to conclude, that when we read of *Biſhops* in the *plural* within that pale of *Iudæa*, theſe are the *Biſhops* of *Iudæa*, and ſo in like manner when we finde the *Biſhop* of *Ieruſalem* mentioned ſeparately, and then thoſe others with him, (expreſt by any title which ſignifies *Biſhops*, be it Ἐπίσκοποι or Πρεσβύτεροι it matters not) and with all, theſe never expreſt to be Πρεσβύτεροι ἐκκλησίας Ἱερουσαλήμ *Elders of the Church of Ieruſalem*, but either *Elders* ſimply, or elſe ἐν or εἰς *in* or *at Ieruſalem*, denoting onely the *place*, where, at that time, they were *preſent*, it will be as little harſh to inferre, that at ſuch time there were *aſſembled* or met together at *Ieruſalem*, *Iames* the *Biſhop* of that *Metropolis*, and the other *Biſhops* of the whole *region*, the *Biſhops* of *Iudæa* with him.

7. From hence there will now be no difficulty to make a briefe *anſwer* to each of their demands, 1. that *Act.* 21. 18. the *Elders* which were preſent with *Iames* the *Biſhop* of *Ieruſalem*, were the *Biſhops* of *Iudæa* which were then, upon the emergent affaires of the *Church*, preſent at *Ieruſalem*, whether all of them aſſembled in *Councel*, to receive an account of Saint *Pauls* tranſactions and ſucceſſes among the *Gentiles*,

tiles v.19. or many of them on any other *Ecclesiasticall* concernment.

But that which puts it out of question, that it was *all* of them in *Councell*, is, what followes *v.*25. where they referre to the *decrees* which had been *conciliarly* delivered *v.* 15. by them, who are now there present, *we have written and concluded.* And what *Paradox* can there be in this, that all the *Bishops* of *Judaea* should be in *Councell* at *Hierusalem*, and St *Peter* and St. *Iohn* with them, and that St. *Paul* should come and give an account of his *travailes* and actions in their presence. 8.

The same answer certainly belongs to the place next mentioned *c.*15.4. where after mention of their *Reception* by the *Church*, followes [*and of the Apostles and Elders*] by the *Church* is meant the *Believers* that were at *Jerusalem*, whether *inhabiting* there continually, or now occasionally *present* there. By the *Apostles*, *James* the *Brother* of the *Lord*, the then *Bishop* of the *Metropolis*, together with *Peter* and *John* the known *Apostles* of *Christ*, this *James* by them set over that *Church*, saith * *Clemens* and † *Hegesippus*, and by S. *Paul* himself reckoned among the *Apostles*, *Gal.*1.19. and so in the title of his *Epistle*, and named before *Peter* and *John* the two *prime Apostles*, as being in this his See, *Gal.*2.9. and exprest to pronounce the *decree* in the *Councell*, Ἐγὼ κρίνω, *I judge*, Act.15.19. and this confirm'd by the *testimonies* of those *Antients* that the *Presbyterians* make the most frequent use of, *Theodoret* and * St. *Hierome*; the former expresly affirming of those times, that they which were after styled *Bishops*, were then called *Apostles*, and the latter styling this *James* particularly, *Apostolum decimum tertium*, the thirteenth *Apostle*. 9.

* Υποτυπ, *l.*6.
† Υπομνημ. ἑ.
* *Commen. in Isa.*

And then what can be more agreeable to the *Context* (to make the *Councell* complete, a *Councell* for the *Churches* of *Syria*, &c. to appeale to) then to render the *Elders* the *Bishops* of all *Judaea*, which were certainly fitter for the turne to joyne in the *Councell*, and give *Law* to other *Cities*, then the bare *Presbyters* of the *one* City of *Jerusalem* could have been esteemed, if any such there had been in the *Church* so early. 10.

11. For though of the *Apostles*, who had an *universall* jurisdiction, and of the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem* (as that was the *prime Metropolis* not only of *Judæa*, but *Syria* also) with the *Bishops* of the whole *Province* in *Councell* with him, some reasonable account may be given, why they should be *consulted* by the *Church* of *Antioch*, and give binding *decrees* in that matter, to all that were subject to that *Metropolis*, yet supposing the *Church* of *Jerusalem* to be governed by *Presbyters*, and that (as these say) the *Elders* mentioned in the *Councell* were none but the *Presbyters* of that particular *Church*, there could no reasonable account be given, why they should joyn with the *Apostles* in this worke, wherein not *Jerusalem*, of which alone they were *Presbyters*, but *Antioch* and other *Cities* of *Syria* and *Cilicia* were immediately concerned, and concluded by the *sentence* of *James*, that must be, (according to their opinion) of one of the *Presbyters* of *Jerusalem*.

12. In the next place what is said of *Act.* 14.23. and *Act.* 11.30. is somewhat unhappily put together, and yet not rectified in the *Errata*. For 1. the *ordeining* Elders *in every Church* to which *Act.* 11.30. is affixt, is not mentioned there, but *Act.* 14.23. and the *sending reliefe*, which in the *Syntaxes* must be affixt to *Act.* 14.23. is not to be met with there, but *Act.* 11.30. But this were imputable to some haste either of *Scribe* or *Compositor*, were there not a second incongruity interweaved in it, *viz.* that when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had *ordeined* them *Elders*, &c. (which was not done till *Act.* 14.23.) *They sent reliefe to the Elders*, (which was done *Act.* 11.30.) which is an evident πρωθύστερον which I cannot discerne how it was usefull for them to be guilty of.

13. As for their *Quæres* raised on these two *Texts*, the *Answers* are obvious, and here to be translated out of the *Dissertations* as formerly, that the πρεσβύτεροι *Elders Act* 11.30. are the *Bishops* of the severall *Cities* of *Judæa*, not the *Presbyters* of that one *City Jerusalem*.

14. For 1. the *famine* that occasioned this charity of the *Antiochians*, was ἐφ' ὅλῳ τῷ οἰκουμένῃ, not upon *Jerusalem alone*, but *all the World*, i.e. in the *Scripture*-stile, *Lu.* 21.26. *Rom.*

*Rom.*10.18. over the *whole Land* of *Judæa*, according to the manner of the *septuagint*, who oft render הארץ *the earth* or the *Land*, when it signifies the *Land* of *Judæa*, by οἰκουμένη the *world*. As *Isa.*10.23. and 13.5.9. and 24.1. and accordingly *Josephus* saith of this time of *Claudius*'s Reigne μέγαν λιμὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γενέσθαι, *that there was a great famine over* Judæa.

Secondly, the charity is distinctly said to be designed by the *Donors*, τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς, *to the brethren that dwelt in* Judæa, in no wise confined to *Jerusalem*, nor consequently can the *Elders* to whom it was sent, and in whose hands it was put, be any others than the *Elders*, i. e. say we, *Bishops* of all *Judæa*. 15.

Thirdly, it is very agreeable to the *office* of *Bishops*, as we find the practice in the *Primitive Church*, to be the *receivers* and *stewards* and *dispensers* of the wealth of any sort, which was brought in to the *Church*, whether by the *offertory* of the *faithfull* in the *Sacrament*, or by the *liberality* of other *Churches*, inlarged to those that were in want. It being *Justin Martyr*'s affirmation of the first times, that all the *offerings* were brought to the Προεστὼς or *President*, and that he was thereby made κηδεμὼν *the Curator of all that were in want*. 16.

And when what is sent to the *Bishop* is supposed to be sent to him, as the *Oeconomus* or *Steward* of the *Church*, not for the inriching himself, but to *provide* for those that *want-ed*, I cannot imagine why this may not be as conveniently supposed, as that it should be sent to the *Presbyters* onely. 17.

So in like manner the Προεστῶτες *Act.*14.23. are *Bishops* againe, and such and only such (as farre as we have any foot-steps of it) were at that time *ordained* in the *Churches*, one in every City where the *Gospell* was received with one or more *Deacons* to attend him. 18.

And to this as the words so often mentioned out of *Clemens Romanus* are most evident, that *the Apostles of* Christ *preaching through* Cities *and* Regions, *constituted their first fruits* εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους *for Bishops and Deacons*, so the 19.

contexts

context in this place of the *Acts* is very agreeable: For here when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had *preacht* and converted a competent number at *Derbe*, v. 12. and returned to the *Cities* of *Lystra*, *Iconium* and *Antioch* v. 22. *confirming the soules of the brethren*, i.e. the *faithfull*, there it followes, before their parting, that they *ordained Elders* κατ' ἐκκλησίαν *in every Church*, that sure is in every of the *Churches* here named, not many in *each*, but *Elders* in all, *one Bishop* in *every Church*, which again is no news for me or any *Prelatist* to affirm, when in the *Epistle* to *Titus*, St. *Paul*'s direction is conformable to his *practice*, appointing him to *ordaine Elders* κατὰ πόλιν, *City by City*, or *in every City*, c. 1. 5. and presently calling the *Elder* so to be *ordained Bishop*, as in the *Epistle* to *Timothy* he is also called.

20. Thus much paines I shall not grudge to have taken, if it be but to rescue a small *booke*, very innocently meant, from the charge of two such *Paradoxes*, as they are called by those, who have not thought fit to *believe* them, and are as unwilling that others should, and therefore conclude their discourse against them with *tragicall expressions of offering manifest violence to the Scriptures*, of being *sufficient*, *instead of upholding Episcopacy*, *to render it odious and contemptible*, &c. And when they have said so much with so little weight of reason to justifie it, they will then part with all *meeknesse* and perfect *temper* [*but we forbeare*] i. e. *abstaine* to adde more, when they had said as much ill as could be. I am sorry there was still any *more bitternesse* within, to be *suppresst*, when there was so much *vented*. However it is, we are now at end of a *second post*, and to have time to breath a while after some *lassitude*.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

Concerning the Opinion of Antiquity in this Queſtion.

Sect. I.

The Teſtimonies of Clemens Romanus, Biſhops *and* Deacons *the onely offices at the firſt.* Corinth *Metropolis of* Achaia. *What* χάρα, *ſignifies. The* Apoſtles *care to prevent contentions about Epiſcopacy.* Hegeſippus's *teſtimony of the contentions at* Corinth. Clement *a* Biſhop.

SOme things there are yet behind in their *Appendix*, wherein I diſcerne my ſelfe to be concern'd, in ſome *directly* and immediately, in others by *remoter* obligation, as when ſome of thoſe *teſtimonies* of *Antiquity*, which are in the *Diſſertations* manifeſted to be perfectly *reconcileable* with our pretenſions, and ſome of them evident *confirmations* of them, are yet by theſe Writers crudely taken up, and made uſe of, as *Teſtimonies* on their ſide, without ever taking notice of that which is ſaid in the *Diſſertations* to cleare the contrary. Num. 1.

Of the former ſort, wherein I am more *immediately* pointed at, there are *foure things*. Firſt, Concerning one *teſtimony* of St. *Hierome*. Secondly, concerning *Ignatius* his *Epiſtles* in generall, and the *appeales* that I make to his *authority*, which they will not allow to have force with them. Thirdly, concerning one *teſtimony* cited by them out of St. *Ambroſe* on *Epheſ.* 4. and *anſwered* by me, but that *anſwer* diſliked and rejected by them. Fourthly, concerning the *Chorepiſcopi*. Of the ſecond ſort, are the *teſtimonies* out of *Clemens Romanus*, *Polycarpe*, *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*, eſpecially the two former of them. 2.

I ſhall therefore briefly ſurvey every one of theſe, and I ſuppoſe I have pitcht on the moſt convenient Method (and that which will give the Reader the *cleareſt* view both of the *judgement* of *Antiquity* concerning *Epiſcopacy* in generall 3.

(to which their *Appendix* professeth wholly to be designed) and more particularly of the truth of those *two* propositions which have been accused as *Paradoxes* in me, but will now appeare not to be such) by taking these *testimonies*, as they lie in the order of *time*, wherein the *Authors* lived, and then that of St. *Hierome*, which happens to be first mentioned by them, *p.*102. will fall to be one of the *last* to which we shall make reply.

4. P. 104. First then for *Clemens*, they thus begin, *sure we are that* Clemens, *who lived in the first century, in his famous* Epistle *to the* Corinthians *(an undoubted piece of antiquity) makes but two Orders of Ministery*, Bishops *and* Deacons. And having set downe the place which testifies this, * Κατὰ χωρὰς οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, and rendered it thus, *Christ Iesus sent his* Apostles *through* Countries *and* Cities, *in which they preached and constituted the first fruits (approving them by the spirit) for* Bishops *and* Deacons *to those who should afterwards believe.* From hence they observe, *p.* 105. *That* Bishops *and* Deacons *were the onely orders of Ministery in the first* Primitive Church. *And that the* Apostles *appointed but two Officers (that is* Bishops *and* Deacons*) to bring men to believe, because when he had reckon'd up three Orders appointed by God amongst the* Jewes, High-Priest, Priests, *and* Levites: *coming to recite Orders appointed by the* Apostles *under the Gospell, he doth mention onely* Bishops *and* Deacons.

Clem. ad Corin. p. 54.

5. And here one would think were little for the *Presbyterians* advantage, even no more than one of my *Paradoxes* would have afforded them, which, from this very *testimony* and some other, concluded that which was then so *strange* for them to heare (yet now can be confest by them) that the *Apostles* at their *first plantations* contented themselves with *Bishops* and *Deacons*, *one* of each, or perhaps *more* of the latter in *every City*.

6. But when these men thus grant the *conclusion* from this place, which I inferr'd, I have yet no reason to boast of their *liberality*, because I suppose it their meaning, that by *Bishops Clemens* meant

meant *Presbyters*, though this they do not so much as say in twice repeating of their *conclusion*.

And yet certainly it needed more than *saying*, *proving* by 7.
some evidence or argument, that Ἐπίσκοποι *Bishops* in that place signifies any thing else but *Bishops*. All that they offer toward a *reason* for this, must be contained in these words of theirs that follow in the former place.

The occasion of that Epistle seemes to be a new sedition raised 8.
by the Corinthians *against their* Presbyters, *p.* 57. 58. Clemens *to remove their present sedition tells them how God hath always appointed severall orders in his* Church, *which must not be confounded; in the* Jewish Church *he appointed High-Priest*, Priests *and* Levites, *And then tells them for the time of the Gospell that* Christ Jesus *sent his* Apostles *as before, citing the words of* Clement already set down.

But certainly this doth not prove *Bishops* in that *Epistle* to 9.
be no more than *Presbyters*, but may as fitly be argumentative for me, that Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* in that *Epistle* signifie *Bishops*. The onely imaginable *medium* of proofe, which can be usefull for their turne, I shall suppose to be this, that *Corinth* was but *one* City, and therefore Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* at, and of *Corinth*, must needs be *Presbyters*, because according to our opinion there were not *more Bishops* in one City.

But to this I answer, 1. That what *Clemens* saith in the 10.
testimony now produced, he speakes not of *Corinth* peculiarly, but of the Cities, and Regions in generall, which the *Apostles* converted, and of them in the *plurall* number, κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις, *through Regions and Cities*, and then in those *many Cities*, there may well be *many Bishops*, and yet certainly no more than *one* in *one City*.

Secondly, that this *Epistle* of *Clemens* to the Corinthians 11.
was not to the *Christians* of that *one City*, but to the whole *Province* of *Achaia*, of which *Corinth* was the *Metropolis*, and wherein the *Proconsull* of *Achaia* resided, and kept his Courts, *Act.* 18. 12. 13. So the *Title* of the *Epistle* inclines, being inscribed to the Church τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν παροικοῦσαν Κόρινθον, which denotes the whole *Province*, then called τὴν χώραν, as when in

Polycarps Epistle, the Church παροικοῦσα Φιλίππους] is not onely that of the City *Philippi*, but of the *Province* belonging to it, and in the other part of the *title* of this *Epistle*, Ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Ῥώμην, *the Church of God dwelling about Rome*,] in the Church of *Rome*, and all that belonged to that *Metropolis*, called by *Ignatius* τόπος χωρὶς Ῥωμαίων, *the place of the Region of the* Romans, *i. e.* the City, and the whole *Region* about it; And so when *Eusebius* mentions *Dionysius* the famous *Bishop* of *Corinth*, he calls him *Bishop* τῆς ἐν Κορίνθῳ παροικίας, *of the Province of*, or *about* Corinth.

* L. 4. c. 23.

12. And that this is the *truth* of it, and *no conjecture* of mine may appeare by one *character* in the *Epistle*; He tells them that they had formerly received *Epistles* from St. *Paul*. This directs to resolve that these to whom this *Epistle* was addrest, were the same to whom St. *Paul's* were formerly sent, And it is evident that those were the *Saints* or *Christians* in *all Achaia*, 2 Cor. 1. 1. And the same is doubtlesse implied by the phrase *in every place*, 1 Cor. 1. 2. not *in every place* simply of the *World* (for it was no *Catholick Epistle*, but a particular admonition for particular faults, *incest*, &c.) but in that *whole Province* or *Region* of *Achaia*. So that which *Apollos* is said to have done among them (*Apollos hath watered*) 1 Cor. 3. 6. appeares by the *story* Act. 18. 27. to have belonged to *all Achaia*. And so what the *Apostle* writes to them of sending their *offertory* to *Judaea*, 1 Cor. 6. 1. 2 Cor. 8. and 9. doth appeare by *Rom.* 15. 26. to appertaine to *all Achaia*, *Macedonia*, saith he, *and* Achaia *have pleased to make a contribution*, and 2 Cor. 9. 2. *I know your forwardnesse, that* Achaia *hath been ready above a yeare agoe*. Where the [ὑμῶν *you*] and [*Achaia*] must needs be of the same *latitude*, and so againe it is c. 11. 9. compared with *v.* 8. And so those of St. *Paul*, and consequently this of *Clement* was not to the City of *Corinth* alone, but to all the Churches of *Achaia*, and if among them there were more *Bishops* than one, there will certainly be no newes in that; and if those *Bishops* (according both to the nature of the word, and the use of it in those dayes before and after *Clement*) were styled some-

ſometimes ἐπίσκοποι, ſometimes πρεσβύτεροι alſo, then all is very agreeable to all that we contend for, that there was *one Biſhop*, not a Colledge of *Presbyters* in *Clements* dayes in every City.

And this is directly the importance of *Clements* words, as they lie in the *Epiſtle*, ἐξεπέμφθη, ſaith he, ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ, *Chriſt was ſent out from God, and the Apoſtles from* Chriſt (*As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*.] And then to ſhew that the *Biſhops* were in the ſame manner ſent, *i. e. commiſſionated* by them, he addes, that they, *i. e.* the *Apoſtles* ἐξῆλθον κηρύσσοντες *went out Preaching*, κατὰ χώρας καὶ, &c. *Therefore Preaching through* Regions *and* Cities, *they conſtituted their firſt fruits—for* Biſhops *and* Deacons, Cities *and* Regions in the *Plurall*, and *Biſhops* and *Deacons* proportionable thereto. 13.

And when he addes that they were thus made of their *firſt fruits*, i. e. of thoſe that were firſt converted by them, and to this end, that they might be *officers* of thoſe which ſhould *after believe* (ſuppoſing that there were not *many* now that did ſo.) this is directly a *deſcription* of thoſe times, of which *Epiphanius* ſpeakes, ſaying, that when the *Goſpell began to be Preacht, there was yet no neede of* Presbyters, *but* Biſhops *and* Deacons *ſerved the turne*. 14.

And accordingly *Deacons* in thoſe dayes were immediately made *Biſhops*, as is ſufficiently knowne of *Clement* the *Writer* of this *Epiſtle*, who was St. *Peters Deacon* and *Biſhop* after him, as is cleared in *Diſſert* 5. c. 1. Sect. 11. And ſo much for that *firſt teſtimony*. 15.

One thing onely more from hence they are deſirous to conclude, that *in the firſt and pureſt times the cuſtome was to chooſe* Biſhops *in Villages, as well as in great* Cities, grounded upon this, that here *the Apoſtles are ſaid to have appointed Biſhops* κατὰ χώρας, *as well as* κατὰ πόλεις. 16.

But there is no ground of this *concluſion* in this *teſtimony*, For 1. here is no mention of *villages*, χώρα is not *Greek* for 17

them, but κωμαὶ, and 'tis the former, not the latter which here we finde. It is evident what is meant by χωραὶ, when it is joyned with πόλεις *Cities*, viz. *Provinces*, which have each of them *many Cities* in them, and when it is joyned with κωμαὶ *Villages*, it fitly *denotes Regions*, in which there are *many Villages*.

18. So ſaith * *Strabo* of *Aſia*, Ῥωμαῖοι ἐπαρχίαν ἀπέδειξαν τὴν χώραν, *the Romans made that Region a Province*, and ſo in the *Eccleſiaſtical* writings χώρα is a *Province* made up of *many Cities*, each of which had a *Biſhop* over them, as when in the * *Councel in Trullo.* Κυπριανὸς Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀφρων χώρας, *Cyprian* is ſaid to be *Archbiſhop of the Region of the* Africanes, *Region* there ſignifying the *whole Province* under that *Metropolitane*, and ſo * *Cyprian* himſelfe makes it his obſervation, *Jampridem per omnes provincias & ſingulas urbes inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi. Anciently through all the Provinces and each of the Cities, Biſhops were inſtituted.* Where the *Biſhops* in the ſeveral *Provinces*, as thoſe differ from the *Biſhops* in each *City*, are undoubtedly *Archbiſhops*.

* *Geo. lib.* 13.

* *Can.* 2.

* *Ep.* 52.

19. And if that place ſo very agreeable to this of *Clemens* may be allowed, to give us the meaning of it, we ſee what it will be, and how diſtant from theſe mens *concluſion* that the *Apoſtles inſtituted Biſhops* in every *City*, and in each *Region* or *Province*, and in the *Metropolis* or *chiefe City* of it, a *Metropolitane* or *Archbiſhop*.

20. But then 2. if χώρα ſhould ſignifie, as they would have it, a *company* of *villages* or little *townes* lying neer together, ſo as to be here uſed in *oppoſition* to the *Cities*, yet could it not be from hence concluded, that the *Apoſtles* conſtituted *Biſhops* in thoſe *villages*. The words are, *they preached through regions and Cities, and conſtituted their firſt fruits* (earlyeſt converts) *into Biſhops and Deacons*, which will be perfectly true, though all the *Biſhops* and *Deacons* conſtituted by them, had their *fixt* ſeats of *reſidence* in the *Cities*; For that they conſtituted *Biſhops* in the *Regions*, is not here affirmed.

21. Much more might be ſaid in this matter, to ſhew that the utmoſt *conceſſions* that the *adverſaries* could demand from hence, would no way hinder or diſadvantage our *pretenſions*, but

but onely give the *Chorepiſcopi* a greater *Antiquitie* in the *Church*, than either they or we have reaſon to thinke they had, of which whole matter the reader may ſee a full diſcourſe, *Diſſert.* 3. c. 8. Sect. 25. &c. and of it ſomewhat we ſhall anon have occaſion to *repete* from thence.

The *ſecond Teſtimony* of *Clemens* is ſet down by them in theſe words, *That the Apoſtles knowing by Jeſus Chriſt, that there would* 22. Pag. 57. *a contention ariſe, περὶ ἐπιϛοπῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος about the name of Biſhop, & being indued with perfect foreknowledg they appointed the aforeſaid (that is, the aforeſaid orders of Biſhops and Deacons)* &c. Here they require *two things to be noted, 1. that by name is not meant the bare name of Biſhop, but the honour and dignity, as it is taken, Phil.* 2. 9. *Epheſ.* 1. 21. *Heb.* 1. 4. *Rev.* 11. *ſo that ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι is ἐπὶ ἀξιώματι & ὑπεροχῇ, The controverſie among the Corinthians was not about the name, but dignity of Epiſcopacy; for it was about the depoſition of their godly Presbyters,* pag. 57. 58. *2. That the onely remedy appointed by the Apoſtles for the cure of all contentions ariſing about Epiſcopacy, is, by committing the care of the Church to Biſhops and Deacons: Afterwards the Church found out another way, by ſetting up one Biſhop over another; But Clemens tells us, that the Apoſtles indued with perfect foreknowledge of things ordained only Biſhops and Deacons for a remedy of Schiſmes.*

To this they adde (to ſupperſede farther *citations* out of this 23. *Epiſtle*) *It would be too long to recite all that is ſaid in this Epiſtle for the juſtification of our propoſition, let the Reader peruſe* pag. 57. 62. 69. 72. *and take notice that thoſe which are called Biſhops in one place, are called Presbyters in another, and that they are ἀσυνωνύμως throughout the whole Epiſtle.*

What this *whole Epiſtle* will yeild toward the proof of their 24. *propoſition*, which is, [*That after* Chriſts Aſcenſion *the* Church *of* God *for a certaine ſpace of time, was governed by a Common Counſel of* Presbyters *without* Biſhops] I thinke it reaſonable for any that hath not read it, to *conjecture* by theſe two *teſtimonies*, which theſe, who *aſſert* the *propoſition*, and here undertake to *prove* it, have thought fit to *cull* out of it, having withall nothing more to *collect* for their turne from the reſt of the *Epiſtle*, particularly from the *comparing* thoſe *foure* pages, 57. 62. 69. 72. but only this, that they which are called

Biſhops

Bishops in one place, are called πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* in another.

25. Now this last they know is the very thing that I contend (as from the *Scripture*, so) from this and other *antient* writings, that Ἐπίσκοπος and Πρεσβύτερος, [*Bishop* and *Elder*] are words of the same *importance*; all the question is, whether at the first *both* imported *Bishops* or both *Presbyters* in our *moderne* notion. That there is no one circumstance so much as offered by them to consideration, which may incline it their way, is evident by their owne words, neither of their *two notes* pretending to it, only their *conclusion* affirming, that they are ἰσοδυναμοῦντα, *words* of the same *importance*. The whole matter therefore will still divolve to this one *Quare*, whether, when *Clement* saith of the *Apostles* that they *constituted* none but *Bishops* and *Deacons*, by *Bishops* a *College* of *Presbyters* in *every City* be to be understood, or rather *one Bishop*, with his *Deacon* or *Deacons* in *every City*.

26. For the clearing of this one difficulty (for this being evinced, all that their *two notes* affirme, is directly on our side against them) I shall here intirely set downe the whole place last produced, of which they have left out one halfe. It is thus, Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς· διὰ ταύτην οὖν αἰτίαν, πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, καθίστασαν τοὺς προειρημένους (ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν) καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν δεδόκασιν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσι, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. *Our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ* (that must be by *revelation* from him) *that there would contention arise upon the name* or *dignity of Episcopacie* (i. e. about the *authority* of *Bishops* in the *Church*, some *opposing* it, and casting them out of their *Offices*, as here in the *Church* of the *Corinthians*, and through all *Achaia* was actually come to passe at this time, and occasioned this *Epistle* to them) *For which cause therefore the* Apostles *having received perfect foreknowledge* (that there would be such *contentions* on this occasion) *did* (for the *preventing* of them) *constitute the forementioned* (Bishops *and* Deacons *of those which should come in to the Faith* in their *new plantations*) *and after them* (so μεταξύ

μεταξύ signifies in *Barnabas's Epistle*, Sect. 10. λαὸς ὁ μεταξύ *the people that should be after*, and εἰς τὸ μεταξύ, *Act.* 13.42. that which should *follow* the *next after*) *gave a Series* or *Catalogue*, or *manner of succession* (i.e. set downe a *note* of them which in *each Church* should *succeed* the *present Incumbent*) *that when they dyed, other approved men might succeede to their office or ministery.*

What can be more manifest, than that the *dignity*, which the *Apostles* conferred on the *Bishops* in *each City* and *Province*, which in the former *Testimony* hath been cleared to belong to *single Bishops*, not to any *College* of *Presbyters*, was by them *foreseen*, that it would be matter of *Contention*, occasion of *Sedition* in the *Church*: for the prevention of which, they used the probablest meanes imaginable, named *successors* to the present *Bishops* in every *Church*, who should supply the *vacant* places, as soon as they fell, and so prevent *suing* and *contending* for them, and were by the speciall *Spirit* of *God* directed, who those *successors* should be; so that the *opposing* their *succession*, or casting them out afterwards, must be a great *sin*, even of *resisting* the *Spirit* of *God*, who had *designed* them to this *inheritance*. Which, next to *Christ's bearing* them in his *right hand*, *Rev.* 1.20. is the greatest *character* of *dignity*, and evidence of *Christ's approving* of the *Order*, and care of *continuing* it, as the *originall* of *union* (not *division*) in the *Church*. 27.

There is not by these men one word of *objection* offered against this *conclusion*, thus formerly deduced in the *Dissertations*, and therefore I need adde no more for the *vindicating* this *testimony*, yet will it not be amisse here to interpose the words of *Hegesippus*, one that was *present* at the time of that *sedition*, and gives an account of it in * *Eusebius*, ἐπέμενεν, saith he, ἐν τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν Κορινθίων μεχρὶ Πείμου ἐπισκοπεύοντος ἐν Κορίνθῳ, *The Church of the* Corinthians *continued in the right, untill* Primus *was* Bishop *of* Corinth. Which is a *testimonie* as antient as that of *Clement*, and tells us what *Bishops* they were which *Clement* speakes of, such as *Primus* was at *Corinth*, i. e. one *singular Governour* in a *City*. 28.

* L. 4. c. 22.

The same will be yet more manifest, if we consider what by 29.

all *Authors* is affirmed of *Clemens* himselfe, the *writer*, at the time of writing this *Epistle*, that having been Saint *Paul's fellow-labourer*, *Phil.*4.3. *Saint Peter's Deacon* (*Ignat. in Ep. ad Trall.*) he was now *Bishop* of *Rome*, by the joynt suffrage of *Irenæus* and all the *Antients*, even of Saint *Jerome* himselfe in his *Catalogue*, and by him styled an *Apostolical* person on *Isa.* 52. a *companion* of the *Apostles* (*in Interp. Cam. Orig. in Rom.*) and by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Strom.lib.4.an *Apostle* in the sense that *Theodoret* saith, those whom in his time they called *Bishops*, had been at first called *Apostles*.

30. Accordingly of him, saith *Irenæus* in his *Catalogue* of the *successive Governors* of the *Church*, τέτῳ τὸν τὸν τῶν Ἀποστόλων τὸν ἐπισκοπὴν κληρῶται Κλήμης, *in the third place from the Apostles* Clemens *came to the* Bishoprick, Which how it is easily to be accorded with those who truly make him *Peters immediate successor*, see *Dissert.*5 c.1.Sect.6.&c.

31. Other *testimonies* there are producible from this *Epistle* of *Clement*, which are all to the same purpose with the former; As when he findes an *image* of the *Ecclesiasticall state* under *Bishops* and *Deacons*, in the *prophecie* of *Isaiah*, cap. 60. 17. where in the *Greek* translation, then in use, he had read κατα-στήσω ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει, *I will constitute their Bishops in righteousnesse, and their Deacons in faithfulnesse*, speaking of the *Judges* and their *Ministers* and *officers* in every *City*.

32. And so againe when he exhorts them to give *due honour to the Elders* among them, talkes of their *sedition* against their *Elders*, and casting them out of their *Episcopacy*, in one place (ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλλειν) and removing them from that *honoured office* (τιμιωτάτης λειτουργίας μεταγαγεῖν) in another, and the like; All of the *same* importance, and to be interpreted by the former.

Sect.

Sect. II.

The Testimony of Polycarpe. *That he was himselfe a Bishop. His mention of* Ignatius's Epistles, *fit to give authority to them, being so confirmed as it is by a series of the Antients.*

IN the next place followes their *testimonie* out of *Polycarpe*, introduced in this manner, Num. 1.

The like Record we have of Polycarpe *that famous Disciple of* John *the Apostle, who lived also within the first century, and wrote an Epistle to the* Philippians, *in which he makes also but two Orders of Ministery, Bishops and Deacons, and perswades the* Philippians *to be subject to their Presbyters and Deacons, as to God and Christ.*

To this *Testimony* from *Polycarp* there is no reason I should deny any part of my *assent*, being so perfectly such, as the cause which I defend requires; If there be with him but *two orders* of *Ministery, Bishops and Deacons*, and he perswades the *Philippians* (i.e. that whole *Province*, the same to which Saint *Paul* had written, consisting of *many Churches*, all under that *Metropolis* of *Philippi*) to be subject to their πρεσβύτεροι and διάκονοι, *Elders* and *Deacons*, and sets the *former* of them, in the *comparison*, to answer *God* the *Father* the *supream Monarch* of *Heaven*; and the latter to be the parallel to *Christ* who came out from *Heaven* upon his *Fathers* messages, then what reason have I to doubt, but that these *Elders* and *Deacons* are the very same which Saint *Paul* had called *Bishops* and *Deacons*, *Phil.* 1. 1. which that it belonged to the severall *Bishops* of that *Province* of *Macedonia*, hath before been sufficiently vindicated. 2.

And therefore without farther debating this *Testimony*, I shall adde some few things concerning this *Polycarp*, which will helpe conveniently to cleere the whole matter. 3.

First, That as it is most true, that is here said of him, that he was a *famous Disciple* of *John* the *Apostle*, so this is added to his titles by the *authentick Epistle* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, 4.

Οὗ γέγονεν ὁ διδάσκαλος ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις,

διδάσκαλος Ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς γενόμενος. *This was the most Wonderfull person in our times, being an Apostolicall and Prophetical Doctor,* and that he was a most *glorious Martyr,* is the designed matter of that whole *Epistle.*

5. Secondly, That this *famous, most admirable Apostolical Doctor* and *Martyr,* was the *Bishop* of *Smyrna,* and so constituted by the *Apostles,* as will appeare by three *Testimonies,* each of them irrefragable. 1. By the *Epistle* of that *Church* of *Smyrna,* written on purpose concerning his *Martyrdome,* a *reverend* piece of *Antiquity,* fit to compare with any that remaines in the *Church.* And there we finde in the close of his *titles,* Ἐπίσκοπός τε τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, that he was *Bishop of the Catholike Church, which is in Smyrna,* i. e. both of *Iewish* and *Gentile Christians* there.

6. So *Polycrates* (the *eight Bishop* of *Ephesus,* borne within a while after Saint *John's* death) in his *Epistle* to *Victor,* Πολύκαρπος ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς, *Polycarp the Bishop of Smyrna and Martyr.*

7. So *Irenæus,* lib. 3. cap. 3. speaking of him, saith, καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων καθισταθεὶς εἰς τὸν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἐπίσκοπος, that he was *constituted by the Apostles Bishop of the Church of Smyrna in Asia.*

8. And then what possibility can there be, that he being thus a *Bishop,* nay *Metropolitane* himselfe, (as hath formerly been shewed) writing to another *Metropolis,* and commanding to *obey* the Πρεσβύτεροι and *Deacons,* should meane any thing else but *Bishops* by Πρεσβύτεροι.

9. Thirdly, That this *Polycarp,* as in this *Epistle* he acknowledgeth to have received an *Epistle* from *Ignatius* (Ἐγράψατε μοὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ Ἰγνάτιος, *You wrote to me, and to Ignatius* also) so he tells them that he had sent them a *collection* of the same *Ignatius's Epistles.* Τὰς ἐπιστολὰς Ἰγνατίου πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλους ὅσους ἔχομεν παρ' ἡμῖν, ἐπεμψάμεν ὑμῖν καθὼς ἐνετείλασθε, ἅτινες ὑποτεταγμέναι εἰσὶ τῇ ὑπομονῇ ταύτῃ, ἐξ ὧν μεγάλα ὀνησθήσεσθε—*The Epistles of* Ignatius *sent to us by him, and as many others as we had by us, we have sent to you, as you required, which are subjoyned to this Epistle, by which you may receive great benefit.*

By

By this passage it is cleare, that as *Ignatius* wrote one *Epistle* to *Polycarpe*, another to the *Church* of *Smyrna*, whereof *Polycarpe* was *Bishop*, both contein'd under the phrase πεμφθεῖσας ἡμῖν, *sent to us*, (as it is explain'd by *Eusebius* in these words, Διὰ γραφῆς ὁμιλεῖ Ἰγνατίῳ τῇ Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἰδίως ἢ τῷ ταύτης προηγουμένῳ Πολυκάρπῳ, Ignatius *wrote to the Church of* Smyrna, *and severally to* Polycarpe *the Ruler thereof*) so he wrote divers others also, which at that time, before *Ignatius*'s death were by the *Philippians* desired from *Polycarpe*, and by *Polycarpe* transmitted to them, and so cannot with any sense be affirmed to be forged, and affixt to his name after his death. 10.

How these *Epistles* were from *Polycarpe* brought down to the hands of *Irenæus*, who lived in *Polycarp*'s time, and saw him an *old* man, and so testifies in his *Epistle* to *Florinus*; and cites a notable passage out of *Ignatius*, which we now have in his *Epistle* to the *Romans*: How, soone after *Irenæus*, * *Origen* cites them again, calling him *Martyr* and *Bishop* of *Antioch*, the *second* after *Peter*, and setting down the very words which we now have in the *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*; How, after *Origen*, † *Eusebius* sets down the whole story of writing them, together with a distinct *Catalogue* of *seven*, to *Ephesus*, to *Magnesia*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Romans*, to the *Philadelphians*, to the *Smyrneans*, and to *Polycarpe*: And in like manner *Athanasius*, citing from *Ignatius* words which we now finde in his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*, and *Theodoret* in many passages out of that to the *Ephesians*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Smyrneans*; And at last St. *Hierome* (on whose authority the *Presbyterians* so much depend) according exactly with *Eusebius*, to give these seven Epistles of *Ignatius* a full authority with all; All this I say hath been at large deduced and evidenced in the *Dissertations*; And this, one would thinke, might have been sufficient to have given *Ignatius* some place among their *Testimonies* for the *opinion* of *antiquity* in this matter, especially when that very Epistle of *Polycarpe*, which for the bare name of Πρεσβύτερος *Elders* used by him, they cite, and give him his *just* honour, doth give testimony to the Epistles of *Ignatius*, as cleare, and 11.

* In Luc. Hom. 6.

† L. 3. c. 35. 36.

Catal. Script. & ad Hilvid c. 9.

Dissert. 2. c. 24.

as universally, and fully confirmed by others, as any, by which that Epistle of *Polycarpe* or *Clemens*, or any other antient writing stands in the *Church*.

12. But all this, it seemes, is of no weight with them, and therefore after the two testimonies of *Clemens*, and one of *Polycarpe*, backt with the like number of *three* more, a saying of *Bishop Bilson* (very unlikely to be to the *prejudice* of *Bishops*, if it were here seasonable to examine it) and the like of *Gratian*, and the third of the Lord *Digby*, They are then at leisure to remember what out of *Ignatius* is objected against them; Had he by any possible colour of any passage in him, been capable of doing them any service, he might then, as his Epistles were written before *Polycarps*, have also been called out and cited before him; But all those Epistles being so *diametrally* contrary to their pretensions, as every man knowes they are, he is now to be lookt on and answered, as *temptations* are wont to be, to be mentioned only, that he may be rejected by them.

Section III.

A vindication of Ignatius's Epistles, Vossius's *edition of them, and the* Archbishops *of* Armagh. *Some Testimonies out of them. The cause of his so inculcating obedience to* Bishops. *Mr.* Causabones *Testimony considered, and the Allegations from the* Archbishp *of* Armagh. *Three Reasons against these* Epistles *answered.* (*No Marriage without the* Bishop.) *Of the Reformed Churches. Of the Church of* Scotland *after the first conversion.*

Num. 1. THus therefore they proceede, *p.* 107. *Against all that hath beene said in this proposition, it is objected, that the blessed St.* Ignatius, *who lived in the first century, hath in his* Epistles *clearely and fully asserted Episcopall Government, as it is distinct from* Presbyteriall, *and that therefore there was no space of time, wherein the* Church *of* Christ *was governed by the common councell of* Presbyters *without* Bishops *properly so called.*

I doe not conceive that they have said any thing of any availe,

availe, for the proving their *Proposition*, and presume that neither from *Clement* nor *Polycarpe* it hath appeared that they have gained any thing; And therefore against all that they have said there is no need that I should make any *Objection*. But in a farre larger style I think it were no insolence to say, that against all that was ever imagined by any to be producible out of *Antiquity* in behalfe of *Presbytery*, the bare testimonies of this one *Apostolicall Martyr*, *Ignatius*, will be abundantly sufficient, being put in the other Scale, to weigh them all downe and decide the *controversie* on the *Prelatists* side.

It were here unreasonable at large to recite all these *testimonies*, being already set downe particularly *Dissert.* 2. c. 25. and the notoriety of the *fact* being such that a speciall *Objection* against the Epistles is, that he every where asserts *Episcopacy*. And therefore the onely way that could be invented for the supporting the *Presbyterians* interest against such direct *Testimonies*, so (every where) inculcated, and so impossible to be reconciled with their assertions, is this which they give us, *p.* 108. in these words. 2.

In answer to this we must intreat the Reader to take notice that in the Primitive Times there were abundance of Spacious and supposititious workes put forth under the Names of the Apostles and blessed Martyrs, *which were none of theirs*, &c. *The like fraud hath been used in* Ignatius's *workes*, &c. 3.

Here first 'tis a little *strange* that the *spurious* and *suppositious workes* of the *Apostles* and *Martyrs* should be said to be put forth in the *Primitive* Times, unlesse that phrase *Primitive*, be taken in a very great *Latitude*, I had thought that it had been in *after*-times, when *errors* were gotten in, and sought *patronage* and covert from the *Primitive Fathers*, that these *spurious brats* were borne, and affixt to great Names; And by this meanes indeed they are generally descryed, by their *impudent* mentioning of some matters of *fact*, which fell out in those *latter*-times, and so discovered the *imposture*. 4.

But this mistake importeth not much to our present *controversy*: If what is here confidently *affirmed*, [*The like fraud* 5.

fraud was used in Ignatius's workes] can be any way *proved* to have *truth* in it, either in respect of the *Primitive* or *after*-times, I shall not quarrell upon such *niceties*. I shall therefore examine their proofes which follow.

6. And *first*, say they, *it is certaine the* Epistle *of the blessed Virgin* Mary *to* Ignatius, *and of* Ignatius *to the blessed Virgin, and two other* Epistles *of* Ignatius *to* John *the* Apostle *are spurious and counterfeit.*

7. To this I most willingly yeild, that the Epistles under *Ignatius's* name to the *blessed Virgin* and St. *John* may very probably be deemed none of his, and so they are generally rejected by those who mainteine *ours*, as well as *their* interests. I shall onely adde that there is no one word in them concerning *Bishops*, nor were they ever produced by any *Prelatist* in defence of them.

8. Next then, say they, *As for his other twelve* Epistles, *five of them are by invincible arguments, as we conceive, proved by* Vedelius *to be written by a* Pseudo-Ignatius. Eusebius *and* Hierome *make mention but of seven.*

9. Here also will easily be granted by us whatsoever is demanded; For though *Vedelius* a *Divine* of *Geneva* since the casting out of their *Bishop* and setting up of the *new Government*, might well be lookt on as a *partiall* arguer or *Judge* concerning *Ignatius's* writings, yet it being true, and by me formerly acknowleged that *Eusebius* and St. *Hierome* mention but seven Epistles of his, I shall also be ready to yeild to the utmost that *Vedelius* contended, that there be no more then *seven Genuine Epistles* of *Ignatius*, not that every of the other *five* can be proved to be *suppositious*, but because the antient testifications of the *Church* doe not make it so evident, that those other *five* are all his, as of the other *seven* they doe.

10. According to this concession it is, that in the *Dissertations* all the *Testimonies* which are produced in defence of *Episcopacy*, are taken out of those seven Epistles which St. *Hierome*, the *Presbyter*, and onely trusted friend of the *Presbyterians*, doth acknowledge to be his.

11. But of these *seven* also they have somewhat to say, in these words,

words: *And for those seven, though with* Scultetus, Vedelius *and* Rivetus *we doe not renounce them as none of his, yet sure we are, they are so much adulterated and corrupted, that no man can ground any solid Assertion about Episcopacy from* Ignatius's *workes.*

I hope I shall not now be lookt on, as an *intemperate asserter* of *Episcopacy*, if in this third *step* also I goe so farre with the *Presbyterians* as to yeld that I shall rest contented even, with those *parcells* of those seven Epistles, which these most rigid *censors*, even *Vedelius* himselfe, which published him at *Geneva*, is content to acknowledge for his. If this be allowed me I shall need demand no more; The matter is evident, any man may consult *Vedelius*'s *edition*, and finde *testimonies* as cleare for our turne, as could be wisht, in those parts of those Epistles which he allowes of. 12.

But for the purging of *Ignatius*, as of all other *Antients*, I suppose the Method, which *Vedelius* used, proceeding for the most part, by his owne *conjecture* and phansie, is not likely to be the best; The one course which any *Judicious* Man would require or depend on, hath been used in this matter, since *Vedelius* had done his best; I meane the most *antient copies* in *Europe* have been consulted, and *God's Providence* hath been *eminently* discernable in the *result* of that *inquiry*. 13.

Isaac Vossius, a knowne *learned* Man of that part of the *Reformed Church*, which is governed by *Presbyters*, hath met with an *Antient Manuscript* in the *Medicean library*, which hath none of the *suspected Epistles*, and is perfectly free from those passages, which were formerly among *sober* Men made matter of *suspicion* against the *Epistles*; And as in them we finde those very passages intire, which the *Antients* have cited out of them, so from them againe all the *Testimonies* are fetcht, which we desire to make use of in this matter. 14.

So that if ever *Ignatius* wrote those *Epistles* which from *Polycarpe* downward the *Antients* generally agree that he wrote, I have no reason to feare or doubt but his *authority*, and the *Testimonies* I have brought from him, will be of full value and force in this matter. 15.

16. When this *Copy* out of the *Medicean Library* was firſt tranſcribed by *Voſſius*, the greateſt enemies of *Epiſcopacy* were much taken with it; *D. Blondel* confeſſes that he preſently got a *Tranſcript* of it, compared it with the *Teſtimonies*, which the *Fathers* (*Polycarpe*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Jerome*, *Chryſoſtome*, &c.) had cited out of *Ignatius*, and finding them all to agree with this *copy*, confeſſeth of himſelfe that he was *glad for this age of ours*, that we had now *gotten that very copy that* 1300. *yeares ago*, Euſebius *had uſed*, *and expected great light* from thence. But at length this proved not for his turne, the *Author* ſpake ſo much of *Biſhops* ἀκαίρως συκαίρως, *in ſeaſon* and *out of ſeaſon*, that he ſet himſelfe to form *arguments* againſt it, which are anſwer'd at large in the *Diſſertations*.

17. But beſide this *Greeke copy* of *Voſſius's Edition*, it fell out very opportunely, that the moſt *Reverend Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* about the ſame time met with ſome *antient Latine copies* in *England*, which he thought fit to publiſh, although the *Tranſlation* were *rude* and *barbarous*, and that *Latine Edition* of his was found every where agreeable to that *Greeke* of *Voſſius*, freed, as that, from all *interpolations*, and by this concurrence of theſe *Providences*, there is all reaſon to think that we have at laſt the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, as purely ſet out as either that of *Clemens*, or *Polycarpe*, or any other *antient* writing.

18. And in this *purity* it is that we now appeale to it, and have the *three orders* in the *Church*, *Biſhops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and the *Obedience* and *reſpects* due to them, as evidently and irrefragably aſſerted in very many places, as any truth of *Scripture* can be expected to be.

19. After all this, moſt diſtinctly deduced in the *Diſſertations*, they yet proceed, *we will not*, ſay they, *for our parts trouble the Reader with a large diſcourſe about this ſubject. If he pleaſe he may read what the* Archbiſhop *of* Armagh, *what* Rivet, Vedelius, *and* Cooke *in his* Cenſura Patrum, *and what* Salmaſius *and* D. Blondel *ſay about it, who all of them bring divers arguments to evince the invalidity of theſe* Epiſtles. *There is a Doctor that hath undertaken to anſwer the Objections of*

the

the two last, But this Doctor should doe well to answer also what the Archbishop *of* Armagh, *hath written about these* Epistles, *who proves at large that six of them are* nothæ, *the other six* mixtæ, *and none of them to be accounted* omni ex parte sinceræ & genuinæ, *who also tells us out of* Casaubone, *that among all the Ecclesiasticall Monuments there are none in which the* Papists *put more confidence, than in* Ignatius's Epistles.

This being the summe of their charge on me in this place, 20.
that having *answer'd* all the Arguments of *Blondell* and *Salmasius* (I hope satisfactorily, or else they were very unkinde not to expresse their dislikes of some one *answer*) I have not yet *answer'd* the Arguments of the *Archbishop* of *Armagh* against these Epistles, I shall hope, that when either I have done that, or given competent *reason*, why I need not do it, I shall not need to travaile any farther in this Argument; yet to omit no paines which they can but thinke of prescribing me, I shall take the whole matter of this their last *Section* before me, and consider every part of it.

And 1. For *Rivet*, *Vedelius* and *Cooke* in *Censura Patrum* 'tis evident, that their *exceptions* and *censures* belong 21.
to the *former Printed* Copies of *Ignatius*, that especially which had beene set out by *Mastraus* a *Papist*, against whom *Vedelius* his *Edition* and *Exercitations* were chiefly designed.

But then *Vedelius* having called this *volume* to a very strict 22.
examination, 'tis evident that that *Copy*, which he had thus purged, cannot be still lyable to his and the like *exceptions*, which before were made against the former *Copies*.

As for *Salmasius* and *Blondell*, their exceptions have, as is 23.
here confest, been already examined, and I need say no more of them till those *answers* be some way attempted to be *invalidated*, which here they are not, but instead of it, I am called to answer the *Archbishop* of *Armagh* his Arguments. Lastly, therefore for the *Archbishop* of *Armagh*; It is first somewhat unexpected, that what he had said, as the *ground* and *occasion* of making a new *Edition*, setting out this very *antient Copy*, and by it *purging Ignatius*, who had before

been so *corrupted* in his opinion, should now be proposed to me to be answered, who use that very *Copy*, which that *Archbishop* set out, and acknowledge it was formerly as *corruptly* set forth, as he conceived it to be.

24. Is it not visible that the *Archbishop's* whole designe in two impressions of those Epistles, was to set them out free from all corruptions and mixtures, and interpolations, which they had before been under: And that all his discourses in his *Prolegomena*, were to prove the *former* editions to have been *corrupt*, and so that there was great need of seeking out *better* Copies, and that he verily thought he had now found such? And then what can be required of me to *answer* in his writings, who am directly of his *opinion* in all the *substantiall* parts of the whole matter?

25. As for *lesser* doubts, as whether that one to *Polycarpe* be among the *genuine* or no, though with *Eusebius* and St. *Hierome* I believe it is, and have given the reasons of my opinion, yet I need not *controvert* this with any, because the other *six* will still serve my turne abundantly, and the *Testimonies* out of the most purged *Geneva*, or *Amstelodam*-editions of those *six*, will sufficiently vindicate *Episcopacy* in our present notion of it to be then received, and of the *Apostles* erecting in the *Church*.

26. A few of these *Testimonies* I shall here set downe πρὸς δείξιν, that the *Reader* may know the *unquestionable* opinion of *Ignatius*, and how farre I am from necessity of using any *corrupted copy* of those Epistles. First, then in his Epistle to the *Smyrnaans*, we have the *three Orders* set down distinctly, ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτερίῳ. διακόνοις, and againe ἀσπάζομαι τὸν ἀξιόθεον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ θεοπρεπέστατον πρεσβύτερον, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ διακόνους, the like in 3. places to the *Ephesians*, in 3. to the *Magnesians*, in 4. to the *Philadelphians*, in 4. to the *Trallians*. So secondly we have their particular *Bishops* mentioned, as such, *Polycarpe* of *Smyrna*, in the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, *Onesimus* of *Ephesus* in his congratulation to the *Ephesians*, τοιοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον κεκλῆσθαι, *that they had such a Bishop*, adding *Burrhus* his *Deacon*: *Damas* of the *Magnesians*, together with the names of two of their *Presbyters*, *Bassus*

Baſſus and *Apollonius*, and *Sotion* the *Deacon*, all in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*. *Polybius* of the *Trallians*, in the Epiſtle to them. Thirdly we have his affirmation concerning *Biſhops* through the *whole World*, that they are *conſtituted as, or by the minde of Chriſt*, i. e. *ſent* by him, as he by his *Father*, Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς τῷ πατρὸς * γνώμῃ, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσι. *Jeſus Chriſt is the mind* or by, or *according* to the mind *of the Father* (*ſent* and *Commiſſionated* by him *to reveale* his will to us) *and ſo the* Biſhops *conſtituted through the World are the minde*, or *by the minde of Chriſt*. Fourthly, he tells us that *all* in the *Church*, particularly *Preſbyters*, muſt *yeild obedience* to the *Biſhop*, Πάντες ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, *all follow the Biſhop*, in the Epiſtle to the *Smyrneans*, ἵνα ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ κατὰ πάντα, ἦτε ἡγιασμένοι, *that being ſubject to the Biſhop yee may be ſanctified in all things*, in Ep. ad. Eph. πρέπει πᾶσαν ἐν τρόπῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἐντρέπεσθαι, *yee ought to pay all reverence to the Biſhop*, adding, καθὼς ἔγνων καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, as he had *obſerved their pious* Presbyters *to doe*, though their *Biſhop* were *yong* in Ep. *ad Magneſ.* and againe, ὑποτάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, *be ſubject to the Biſhop*, ſὸ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε *give heed to the Biſhop*, in Ep. ad *Philad.* τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθε, & ἀναγκαῖον ὃτι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθαι, *be ſubject*, and *it is neceſſary to be ſubject to the Biſhop*, and Ἐρρωσθε ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ. *Farewell yee that obey the Biſhop*, in Ep. ad *Trall.* Fifthly, he oft addes, that nothing ought to be done in the *Church* without *licence* of the *Biſhop*, Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι περαινέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *Let none without the Biſhop doe any of the things that belong to the Church*, inſtancing in *Baptiſme* and the other *Sacrament*, in Ep. ad *Smyr.* and ſo in the *Epiſtles* to the *Philadelphians* and *Trallians*. Sixthly, that a convenient *reverence* and *reſpect* is alſo due to the *Preſbyters*, and to the *Deacons*, as is every where taken notice of by him, almoſt in every *Epiſtle*.

* Perhaps γνώμη in both places.

And all this and much more we have in the *Copies*, which are now come, moſt *uncorrupt*, unto us, And there is no imaginable way to avoid the force of theſe *Teſtimonies*, and 27.

the *authority* of that holy *Martyr* for *Episcopacie*, but the *una litura*, *expunging* or *casting* away the whole *volume* of *Epistles*.

28. For the truth is, his whole designe, before his departure from the world, being this one of *divine* Charity, to fortifie the severall *flocks*, to which he wrote, against the poyson of *Hereticks*, the *Gnosticks*, so early creeping in, and despising the *Governors* of the *Church*, (as they had done the *Apostles* themselves) and the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles* being by him knowne to be deposited with the *Bishops* in each *Church*, and having particular *assurance* of the *sanctity*, and sound *faith* of the *present Governors* of these *Churches*, to which he writes, He thinkes fit to make use of this one most *compendious* course, most immediately tending to his *end*, to keep them all in *obedience* to their *Bishops* and *officers* under them, and to make the contrary (as it was indeed) the sure marke of *Haresicks*, whom they were to avoid.

29. And so this is it which hath so fill'd all the *Epistles* (except that one to the *Romanes*) with continuall discourse of the *Bishops*, &c. And it is evident that in that present *conjuncture* of affaires, nothing could with more *reason* and fitnesse have been insisted on.

30. Meane while that I may returne to the place from which I have a while *diverted*, It is so certaine and evident of the *learned Archbishop* of *Armagh*, that he never disputed against the *validity* and *authority* of these *Epistles* thus purged, that it cannot be unknowne to them that thus dispute, what *arguments* he hath urged for the *authority* of them, and in like manner what and how satisfactory *answers* he hath given to the speciall exceptions of others, which very thing occasioned a particular *letter* of *reply* to him from D. *Blondell*, which by that *Archbishops* favour I received, and made my rejoinder to it in the * *Dissertations*.

* Diss. 2 c. 9. Sect 6 &c.

31. This I hope may be sufficient to have said in this matter, instead of undertaking so unreasonable a taske of *answering* any thing asserted by that *Archbishop*.

32. As for that which followes out of him and M. *Casaubone* of *Baronius* and the *Papists* making such use, and placing such con-

confidence in theſe *Epiſtles* above all other *Eccleſiaſticall Monuments*, It is ſpeedily anſwered alſo out of what is already ſaid, that they were the *former* corrupt editions, which were abroad in *Baronius*'s time, with all thoſe *ſuppoſititious additions* & *interpolations*, which the *Papiſts* are either by Mr. *Caſaubone*, or that *Archbiſhop* ſaid to have made uſe of; there being no one word or period in this *volume*, to which my appeale is made, which yeildeth any advantage to the *Papiſts* in any point, nor is it, nor can it be pretended by any that it doth, unleſſe by thoſe in whoſe *opinion* the mainteining of *Biſhops* is reputed for ſuch. And therefore that very *learned* man, M. *Caſaubone*, is ſo far from *rejecting all* theſe *Epiſtles*, that he diſtinctly *promiſeth nonnullarum ex illis antiquitatem ſe novis rationibus tuiturum, that he will, if God permit, defend the antiquity of ſome of them, by reaſons which others had not taken notice of: Exerc.* 16. *Cont. Baron.* Sect. 10. And this *promiſe* of his is cited by the *Archbiſhop*, *Diſſert. de Epiſt. Ign.* pag. 136. ſo farre is it from all *appearance* of truth, which is cited as the *opinion* of theſe two *learned* men.

After all this. *three Reaſons* they will *briefly offer, why they cannot build their judgment concerning the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, about Epiſcopacy upon* Ignatius's *Epiſtles.* 33.

1. *Becauſe there are divers things quoted out of his Epiſtles by* Athanaſius, Gelaſius, *and* Theodoret, *which are either not to be found in theſe Epiſtles, or to be found altered and changed, and not according as they are quoted. This is* R. vets *argument, and purſued at large by the Archbiſhop, to whom we referre the Reader.*

Being among their other *Readers* referr'd to the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* for the *validity* and *purſuit* of this *firſt reaſon*, I ſhall to him very ſecurely make my *appeale*, what force there is in it, againſt the *volume* of *Epiſtles* now twice in ſeverall formes publiſhed by him. And in the *Prolegomena* to the former of them, *pag.* 15, 16 &c. this is moſt evident that the *paſſages* cited by *Athanaſius*, *Gelaſius*, and *Theodoret*, which were not indeed to be found in the former printed *Greek* copies, are exactly diſcerned and evidenced by him to be in the *old latine Interpreter*, which he therefore thought fit to pub- 34.

liſh

liſh both out of *Caius College* and *Biſhop Montacutes Library*. The ſame hath he farther ſhewn, cap 4. pag. 19. &c. out of the ſame and other of the *Antients*, *Euſebius*, *Hierome*, &c. and ſet downe the places in *columnes*, by way of *parallel*, to demonſtrate the *agreement* of this *Copy* with the *genuine Ignatius*.

35. And is it not a little ſtrange, that I ſhould be now referred to that *Archbiſhop* for the *purſuit* of this *argument*, which he hath ſo diſtinctly proved to be of no force againſt the *Copy* which now I uſe, but to concurre in *demonſtrating* the *purity* of it?

36. Their *ſecond Reaſon* they draw from his *over-much extolling himſelfe in his Epiſtle to the* Trallians, *where he ſaith that he had attained to ſuch a meaſure of knowledge, that he underſtood heavenly things, the orders of Angels, the differences of Archangels, and of the heavenly hoſt, the differences between powers and dominations, the diſtances of thrones and powers, the Magnificencies or Magnitudes of Æones or Principalities, the ſublimity of the Spirit, the excellencies of* Cherubims *and* Seraphims, *the Kingdome of the Lord, and the incomparable Divinity of the Lord God almighty. All theſe things I know, and yet am not perfect*, &c. *Now who is there that can believe that ſuch arrogant boaſting can proceed from ſuch an holy man, and humble Saint, as* Ignatius *was?*

37. And who would believe that the writer of this *Appendix*, which had cited the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* in his *Prologomena* to his *firſt Edition* of *Ignatius*, and ſo could not but be able to have conſulted that *Edition*, ſhould thus thinke to defame, and blaſt the whole *volume* of *Epiſtles*, for one ſuch periods ſake, which is not to be diſcerned in this, or that *Archbiſhops latter*, or in *Voſſius's edition* of them, to which onely he muſt know we make our *appeale* for *Epiſcopacy*?

38. In theſe *Copies* the words are quite diſtant from what is here cited, and in effect, directly *contrary* to them, evidences of the greateſt *humility*, now when he was ſo neer the *honor* of *Martyrdome*, Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐ καθότι δέδεμαι ϗ δωάμω τὰ ἐπιεόμια, καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικὰς, ϗ τὰς συςάσεις τὰς ἀρχονλικάς, ὁρατὰ ϗ ἀόρατα, πρὸς τοῦτο ἤδη καὶ μαθητὴς εἰμι, *For*

I am not, becauſe (or *in that*) *I am in bonds able alſo to underſtand heavenly things, the* Poſitions *of* Angells, *their* aſſemblies *of* Principalities (or of the *Rulers* of them) *both things viſible and inviſible. Beſides this, I am yet alſo a Diſciple*, &c. What *arrogance*, I pray, or *boaſting* is there in this? and yet he addes no more in that place but onely, πολλὰ γὰρ ὑμῖν λείπει, ἵνα θεῷ μὴ λειπώμεθα, *For many things are wanting to us that we may not be left behinde by God*, thinking himſelfe utterly *unworthy* of the *honour* (and fearing he may yet *miſſe* of it) to ſuffer *Martyrdome* for him. And ſo much for the *ſecond Reaſon*.

The *third* (*which*, ſay they, *is moſt for our purpoſe*) *is from his over-eager and over-anxious defence of the Epiſcopal Hierarchy, which he doth with ſuch ſtrange and Hyperbolical expreſſions* (*as if all Chriſtianity were loſt, if Prelacie were not upheld*) *and with ſuch multiplyed repetitions*, ad nauſeam uſque, *that we may confidently ſay as one doth*, Certo certius eſt has Epiſtolas vel ſuppoſititias eſſe, vel fœde corruptas, *and that they doe neither agree with thoſe times wherein he wrote, nor with ſuch an holy and humble Martyr as he was. We will inſtance in ſome few of them.* 39. *Ceci cenſura.*

What *reaſons* and *deſigne Ignatius* had to exhort the *Chriſtians*, to whom he writes to *obedience* to their *Governors*, in the *Church*, hath already been ſaid at large, this being the onely expedient, that, at that time, could be thought on, to keep out moſt *dangerous hereſies* out of the *Church*. And therefore what that *holy Martyr* did in that kind, when he was carryed from his owne *Church*, never to returne to it againe, cannot be lookt on, as the ſeeking any *great things* for *himſelfe*, and ſo contrary to either his *piety* or *humility*, but as a deſire full of both thoſe, that the *Church* of *God* might enjoy *truth* and *peace*, after the *beaſts* had *devoured* him. 40.

As for the *ſtrange* and *hyperbolicall expreſſions*, mentioned in the *objection*, and exemplified in the two *following pages*, the *Reader* muſt againe be told, that what they had done moſt *unreaſonably* before, is here *practiſed* againe at large, ſeverall places brought out of the *former corrupt editions* of *Ignatius*, of which no one word is to be found in the *new editions* out of 41.

the most *antient Copies Greek* and *Latine*, from which alone it is evident that we produce all our *testimonies* for *Episcopacy*, and so have produced very few of those, which they are thus pleased to finde *fault* with.

42. The places which they urge, are *eight*, I shall not need to set them down, but give the *Reader* a much shorter, and yet as *satisfactory* an account of them. *Two* are cited from the *Epistle* to the *Trallians*, and neither of them are in any part to be found in our *Editions*. *Two* are cited from the *Epistle* to the *Magnesians*, and the first is not at all in our *Editions*, nor the *second* any farther than thus, ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἀνεν τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησε ἑνωθεὶς ὢν, ἔτε δι' ἑαυτοῦ, ἔτε διὰ Ἀποστόλων, οὕτως μήδε ὑμεῖς ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲν πράσσετε, μήδε πειράσητε εὔλογον τι φαίνεσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῖν. *As Christ being one with his Father did nothing without him, either by himself or by his Apostles, so neither do ye act any thing without the Bishop and the Presbyters, nor endeavour that any thing should appeare reasonable to you which is private*, or of your *owne* devising. A speech in every *sillable* of it, very well becomming that *Holy Martyr*, written by him at a time, when the *truth* being by the *Apostles deposited* with the *Bishops*, all *private* devises of their owne were most justly to be *suspected*.

43. The *fift* is in the *Epistle* to *Polycarpe*, and is in our *Copies* thus, Πρέπει τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμουμέναις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἕνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι. *It becomes the men that marry, and the women that are married, to consummate their union with the consent of the Bishop.* And I wonder what age of the *Church* there hath been from that time to this, which hath not been of the *same* opinion. For what is by *Bishops* committed to *Presbyters*, that is not done ἀνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου, *without the mind of the Bishop* (as elsewhere in those *Epistles* appeares of *Baptisme* and the *Lords Supper*, neither of which, saith he, are to be *meddled* with without the *consent* of the *Bishop*, and many *testimonies* out of *Antiquity* are * elsewhere produced in perfect *conformity* therewith.) And consequently, if in the *Christian Church*, *marriage* hath alwayes been consummated by the *Priest* or *Presbyter*, then cannot this speech of *Ignatius* have any blame in it.

* See Num. 55.

And

And that thus it hath been through all ages, there is little matter of *question* (and no word here produced by the *Objectors* to the *contrary*) * *Tertullian* will be a good competent *testimonie* for the *next Centurie*, speaking of the *felicity* of the *Christian Marriage*, *quoà Ecclesia conciliat, & confirmat oblatio, & obsignat benedictio, Angeli renuntiant*, &c. *Which the Church makes, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper confirmes, the benediction of the Priest Seales, and the Angels pronounce valid.* And in * another place, *Penes nos occultæ conjunctiones*, i. e. *non prius apud Ecclesiam professa, juxta mœchiam & fornicationem judicari periclitantur, Marriages that are not done publickly before the Church, are in danger with us, to goe for adultery and fornication.* 44. Ad Uxor. l. 2. c. ult. De Pudic. c. 4.

The same is every where to be found in the *Decretal Epistles* of *Evaristus*, about *Ignatius*'s time (which makes it a *tradition* from the *Apostles* and their *successors*) of *Soter* not above 50. yeares after, of *Callistus* neer fifty yeares after him, of *Silvester* an 100 yeares after him, of *Siricius* 70. yeares after *Silvester*, of *Hormisdas* 130. yeares after *Siricius*: And though some of these be by D. *Blondel* thought to be of later dates than the *titles* of them would pretend, yet the *authority* of most of them is unquestioned, as to this matter. 45.

And the *antient* piece lately publisht by *Sirmund* concerning the *Heresie* of the *Predestinati*, written, saith he, 1200. yeares since, speakes of it, as a *knowne custome* and *Canon* of the *Church*, over all the world, For, saith that *antient author*, *If marriage be unlawfull, Emendate ergo Ecclesia regulam, damnate qui in toto orbe sunt, sacerdotes, Nuptiarum initia benedicentes, consecrantes, & in Dei mysteriis sociantes, Amend then the rule the of Church, and condemne the Priests which are in all the world, who blesse the beginnings of Marriage, consecrate, and joyne the parties together with the Holy Sacrament.* 46.

And the *fourth Councel* of *Carthage*, before the yeare 400. hath these words, *Sponsus & Sponsa cum benedicendi sunt à sacerdote—When the Bridegroom and the Bride are to be blest by the Priest*, *Can.* 13. And for latter ages the matter is out of *Question*. 47.

48. And so it will be much more *reasonable*, from this passage in *Ignatius*, being found so perfectly *concordant* with other passages of the times so neer him, to resolve the *rule* of the *Church* concerning *sacerdotal benediction* in *marriage* to be received from the *Apostles* and their *successors*, than from finding this speech in one of *Ignatius's Epistles*, to cast away the whole *volume*.

49. As for that which is added at the end of this *testimony* from the *Epistle* to *Polycarpe*, *My soule for theirs, that obey the* Bishop, *Presbyters and* Deacons, there can be no fault in that, supposing as hath been said, that the *Bishops* at that time, & the *Presbyters* & *Deacons* living regularly and in *union* with them, had the *true* safe way among them, wherein any man might walke *confidently*, all danger being from the *Heresies* that crept in, and brake men off from that *unity* of the *faith*.

50. The *sixth* place from the *Epistle* to the *Philadelphians*, of the *Princes* and *Emperors* obeying the *Bishop*, is certainly inserted by forgery in the *former*, for not one word of it, or like it, is to be found in *our editions*.

51. So likewise for both parts of the *seventh* place out of the *Epistle* to the *Smyrnaans*, they are not to be found in our *Editions*.

52. The *last* onely is to be met with there, but that in a much more *moderate* straine, than the former, in *words* and *sense* very agreeable to *wholsome doctrine*, and the *exigencies* of those times, wherein there was no *visible* way to keep out the *tares* of *false teachers*, but by requiring all to be kept to the managery of the true *husbandman*. And accordingly I have cited this very speech out of *Ignatius* for the asserting of *Prelacie* (and if there were no such, the *Epistles* might passe well enough with these, as with all other men, they would have needed no *vindication*, having no *adversary*) The words are these, Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν— *All of you follow the Bishop as Christ Jesus did his Father* (*i. e.* as elsewhere appears by the like expression, with [ἑνωμένῳ ὦν] added to it, be at perfect *unity* of *doctrine*, &c. with

with the *Bishop*, as *Christ* was with *God* the *Father*) *and the* Presbytery *as the* Apostles, *and reverence the* Deacons *as* those that are *appointed by God*, (viz. *mediately* by the *Apostles*.

Where it may be *observable*, that the *objectors* which find such fault with this speech of *Ignatius* in their *quarrelling* with it, leave out this latter part of *Presbytery* and *Deacons*; they cannot finde in their hearts to quarrell, or accuse him for bidding them *follow the* Presbytery *as the* Apostles, the onely crime was to bid them *follow the Bishop* (not, *as Christ* in the *dative*, i.e. *as they follow Christ*, but) *as Christ followes his Father*, the onely peculiar offence, to recommend *unity* with, and *obedience* to the *Bishop*. But that by the way. 53.

It followes in the place, Μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω, *Let no Man without the* Bishop *doe ought which belongs to the* Church, *Let that be accounted a firme* Eucharist, *which is done by the* Bishop, *or him whom the* Bishop *shall permit. Where the* Bishop *appeares there let the multitude be, as where* Christ *is, there is the Catholick Church, It is not lawfull without the Bishop* (i.e. as before, without *commission* from him) *either to Baptize or Administer the* Eucharist, *but what he approves of* (thus in these *publick Ministrations*) *that is well pleasing to God, that it may be safe and firme whatsoever is done*; *It doth well that men know God and the Bishop.* (as their *Ruler* under *God*, with whom his *truth* is by the *Apostles deposited*) *he that honours the* Bishop, *is honoured by God, he that doth any thing clanculary without him, serves the Devill* (performes a very *acceptable service* to him; For so in a very *eminent* manner the Hereticks of that age, the Gnosticks did, which secretly infused their *devilish* Leaven, and deadly *poyson* into mens hearts, by which they took them quite from *Christ*, but could not have done so *successefully*, if this *Holy Martyr's* counsell here had been taken.) 54.

What *inconvenience* can be imagined consequent to our affirming that *Ignatius* was the *author* of these words, I confesse not to comprehend; Of this there is no *question*, but 55.

that it is the ordinary *Language* of the *antient Church*, and accounted necessary in an *eminent* degree, to preserve *unity* and *truth* in the *Church*, and to hold up the *authority* of *Governours* among all, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἢ διάκονοι ἀνεὺ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν, *The* Presbyters *and* Deacons *must doe nothing without the minde of the* Bishop, *Can. Apost.* 40. and the reason is added αὐτὸς γὰρ ὅτι πεπίστευται τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, *for he is intrusted with the people of the Lord*, So in the 56. *Canon* of *Laodicea*, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν ποιεῖν ἀνεὺ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *The* Presbyters *must do nothing without the minde of the* Bishop, and so in the *Councell* of *Arles*, Can. 19. *The* Presbyters *must doe nothing in any Diocesse* sine Episcopi sententia, *without the* Bishops *minde*, *and* sine authoritate literarum ejus, *without authority of his Letters*.

56. All that is here offer'd by them to make the like words in *Ignatius* a competent *charge*, upon which to throw away the whole *volume* of Epistles, is onely this, *If this be true Doctrine*, *what shall become of all the* Reformed Churches, *especially the Church of* Scotland, *which* (*as* John Major *saith* lib. 2. Histor. de Gestis Scotorum, c. 2.) *was after it's first conversion to the Christian faith above* 230 *yeares without Episcopall Government*.

57. To this double question I might well be allowed to render no answer, It being certainly very *extrinsecall* to the *Question* in hand, (which is onely this, whether *Ignatius* wrote or wrote not those Epistles) to examine what shall become of the *Reformed Churches*, &c. It were much more reasonable for mee to demand of the *Objectors*, who suppose their *Presbyteriall platforme*, as that is opposed to *Episcopall*, to be setled in the *Church* by *Divine Right*, If this *Doctrine* be *true*, what did become of all those *Primitive Churches* all the *World* over, which they confesse departed from this *modell*, and set up the *contrary*, and so of all the succeeding ages of the *Church* for so many 100 yeares, till the *Reformation*, and since that also, of all the other *Churches*, which doe not thus farre imitate Mr. *Calvin*, casting out the *Government* by *Bishops*?

Is

Is it not as reasonable that they should be required to give a faire and justifiable account of their dealing with (and *judging*, *post factum*, of) all these, as I should be obliged to *reconcile Ignatius* his speech concerning his *present* age, with the *conveniencies* of the *Reformed Churches*, which he could neither see, nor be deemed to speak of, nor consequently to passe judgement on them by *divination*. 58.

What they were guilty of which secretly infused their *poyson* into Men and Women in *his age*, and would not let the *Bishop* the *Governour* of the *Church*, be the *Judge* of their *Doctrines* and *practices*, he here tells us, *viz.* That they performed *service to the Devill*, in stealing Mens hearts from *Christ*; But what crime it was in those of *Corinth*, and through all *Achaia*, to turne their *Bishops* out of their places, ἐκβάλλειν ἐπισκοπῆς and λειτουργίας, *to cast them out of their Episcopacy* their *Office* and *Ministration*, this he tells them not in that place, *Clemens Romanus* had done it competently in his *Epistle*. 59.

As for the *particular* case of those *Reformed Churches*, which have done more then so, not onely cast out their *present Governours*, but over and above utterly *cast off* the *Government* it selfe, there had been I confesse, a great deale said, both in this and other places of *Ignatius*, and many other *Antient* Writers, who yet never *foretold* these *dayes*, abundantly sufficient to have restreined them from so *disorderly* proceedings, if they would have pleased to have *hearkned* to such *moderate counsells*. But having not done so, *Ignatius* hath gone no farther, he is only a witnesse against them, he undertooke not the *Office* of a *Judge* so farre beyond his *Province*, hath pronounced no *sentence* upon them. 60.

And to proceed one degree farther, to the *successors* of those in the *Reformed Churches* (as many as are justly blameable for treading in their Leaders steps) though I may truely say, they have as little taken that *Holy Martyrs* advise, and more than so, that they have retaind a *considerable corruption* in their *Churches*, and that they should doe well, if now they know how, to restore themselves to that *model*, which they find every where *exemplified* in *Ignatius*, yet till they 61.

shall

ſhall have done ſo, I know that they are *exactly* capable of being *concern'd* in any part of theſe words, laſt cited from *Ignatius*.

62. For they that have no *Biſhop* at all, cannot be required to *doe nothing without conſulting with the Biſhop*; They are juſtly to be *blamed*, as farre as they are guilty, that they have no *Biſhop*; but then that is their *crime* (and they are to *reforme* it as ſoone as they pleaſe) but that being ſuppoſed, this of not *conſulting* the *Biſhop*, while they have *none*, is no *new* crime, nor liable of it ſelfe to the *cenſure* of διαβόλῳ λατρεύειν here, which was affixt to thoſe that had *Biſhops*, and would not have their *Doctrines* examined by that *ſtandard*, of which they were the *Depoſitaries*. And this is as much as is needfull to be ſaid in this place for that firſt *inconvenience* affixt to *Ignatius*'s words.

63. As for the other, the *Church* of *Scotland* in it's *firſt converſion*, the matter againe is ſo remote from the taske we have now in hand, for the *vindicating* the *Authority* of *Ignatius*'s *volumne* of Epiſtles, and withall ſo *uncertainly* ſet downe by *Authors*, that it would be *unſeaſonable* to engage farre in ſo *darke* a part of *Hiſtory* ſo impertinently. In briefe therefore, though I have not *John Major* by me to conſult, yet I conceive I ſhall not gueſſe amiſſe at the grounds, and conſequently at the truth and weight of his aſſertion.

64. *Joannes Jordanus* was of opinion that **Paſchaſius* a *Sicilian prima Chriſtianæ pietatis rudimenta mandante P. Victore in* Scotia *nuntiavit*, *firſt preacht the Chriſtian Faith in* Scotland *by the command of Pope Victor*. And this was about the year 203. And † *Bede* ſaith that in the *eight* yeare of *Theodoſius Junior*, that is about the yeare 431, *Palladius ad* Scotos *in Chriſtum credentes à Pontifice Romanæ Eccleſiæ Cœleſtino primus mittitur Epiſcopus*, Palladius *was by* Celeſtine *Biſhop of* Rome *ſent firſt Biſhop to the* Scots *that believed*. And the diſtance betwixt theſe two termes being 228. yeares, this I conceive the *ground*-work of *John Major's affirmation* here cited, of the 230. yeares, wherein that *Church* after it's *firſt converſion* remained without *Epiſcopall Government*.

* *Demſter. Appar ad Hiſt. Scot.* l. 1. c 6.

† *Eccle. Hiſt.* l. 1. c. 13.

But

But first it is to be noted here, that the saying of *Jordanus* of *Paschasius* in *Victor*'s dayes, is no more than this, that he *preached* the *Gospell* there, *primu rudimenta nuntiavit, declared the first rudiments there*, and, as it followes in *Dempster*, *tyrocinia fidei fecit, laid the grounds of Christianity* among them; And that might be done, and soone moulder away againe, and never come to so much *maturity*, as either to have *Bishops* or *Presbyters* constituted among them. And secondly, though *Bede* say that *Palladius* was sent to them *Episcopus primus*, their *first Bishop*, yet neither he, nor any other affirmes that they were formerly ruled by a *Presbytery*, or so much as that they had any *Presbyter* among them. Nay thirdly, *Dempster* reports it from *Jordanus* but slightly, *Joh. Jordanus putavit, it was the conceit* or *opinion* of that *author*. And that which * *Bozius* tells us will take off much from the *creditableness* of that *Opinion*, Traditur in Scotiâ, quæ tunc erat Hibernia, Christi cultum disseminatum eodem tempore quo in Britanniâ, sub annum Christi 203. Victore sedente. *They say that the faith of Christ was disseminated in* Scotland, *which was then* Ireland, *at the same time that it was in* Britanny, *about the yeare* 203. *in the time of* Victors *Papacy*. 65.

* *Lib. 8. de signis Eccl. c. 1.*

By this it appeares that the conceit of *Jordanus* belonged to *Ireland*, not to *Scotland*, *Ireland* being *antiently* called *Scotia* (as in † *Bede* we finde, *Scotorum qui Hiberniam insulam Britanniæ proximam incolunt*, *the* Scots *which inhabit* Ireland, *and* * *Gentes Scotorum quæ Australibus Hiberniæ partibus morabantur*, *the* Scots *which inhabited the Southerne parts of Ireland*) and that which is now *Scotland*, was then styled *Nova Scotia*, to distinguish it from the *other*. And it is worth remembring that *Marianus* the *Scotch Antiquary* had no knowledge of this *conversion* of *Scotland* under *Victor*, nor is there any shew of it in *Bede*, who tells us of the latter. 66.

† *Li. 2. c. 4.*

* *L. 3. c. 4.*

† *See Baron. Annal. Tom. 5. Anno. 429. Sect. 2.*

Nay it is yet more evident * by *Prosper*, that 'twas a *conversion* from *barbarous* to *Christian*, which is spoken of in *Cœlestines* time, and that the *Faith* was planted, and the *Bishop* constituted there together, *Venerabilis memoriæ Pontifex* 67.

* *Adv. Collat. in fine.*

tifex ab hoc eodem morbo Britannias liberavit, & ordinato Scotis *Episcopo, dum Romanam insulam studet servare, Catholicam fecit etiam barbaram Christianam, Pope* Cœlestine *freed* Britaine *from* Pelagianisme, *and ordained a Bishop for the* Scots, *and so while he indeavoured to keepe a* Romane *Island within the bounds of the Catholick Faith, he also made a barbarous Island Christian.* Which as it differs somewhat from *Bedes* expression of *Palladius*'s being sent *ad credentes*, to believers, so it gives us occasion to propose that which may reconcile these seeming *differences*, viz. 1. That *Christanity* was planted in *Scotland* before *Cœlestine*'s time, derived to them most probably from their Neighbours the *Britaines* here, with whom they are * known to have agreed in the *keeping* of *Easter*, contrary to the custome of the *Romane Church*, and so cannot be deemed to have received the first *Rudiments* of their *conversion* from *Rome*: Then secondly, that this *Plantation* was very *imperfect*, differing little from *Barbarisme*, and so reputed by *Prosper*, till the comming of *Bishop Palladius* among them. Thirdly, that even after that, they retain'd the *usage* of *Easter*, contrary to the *Romane custome*, which still referres to some *rude conversion* of theirs before *Palladius*.

* See *Bede* l. 2. c. 4. *Scotos nihil discrepare à Britonibus in eorum conversatione didicimus*, and c. 19. & l. 3. c. 3. *Hoc enim ordine septentrionalis Scotorum Provincia & omnis natio Pictorũ Pascha Dominicum celebrabat.*

68. By all this it is cleared to us, what is to be thought of *John Major*'s affirmation, which hath now very little appearance of truth in it, and if it had, would be little for the *Presbyterian* interest to insist on it, when after all that time of the supposed *government* of that *Church* by *Presbyters*, it was found directly *barbarous*, and to be planted with *Christianity* anew, at *Palladius*'s coming.

69. Some uncertainty we see there is of the *time* and meanes of *planting Christianity* in *Scotland*, but as to this matter of the 230. yeares under *Presbytery*, there can be no ground to affirme it; For if the *conversion* of it be dated from *Victor*'s time, as that opinion would have it, yet even by that account 'twas after the space, wherein the *Presbyterians* themselves acknowledge *Episcopacy* to have prevailed over *all the World*; and then, upon that account, it must be granted, that whensoever their first *conversion* was, 'twas certainly derived to them

them by those who had *Episcopall Government* among them, and then they having sent them *Presbyters* to instruct and *officiate* (as *Presbyters* not as *Bishops*) among them, those *Presbyters* must be supposed to have continued under those *Bishops* by whom they were sent, whether from *Rome*, or neerer home from the *British*, so farre at least, as that when they failed, their number was supplied from the same *Fountaine* from which they first *sprang*, (in the same manner as our own *experience* tells us of *Virginia*, which since the first *Plantation* continued to receive *Presbyters* from hence) and so continued to be, untill they had *Bishops* ordained and *planted* among them. And so much for that second supposed inconvenience also.

Sect. IV.

Of Salmasius's *conceit that these Epistles were written at the time of Episcopacy first entring the Church.*

THat which followes of the *Justice* of the *Reverend Presbyterian Divines censure* of these Epistles, & of *Salmasius's* his beliefe, that they were written by a *Pseudo-Ignatius*, will not require any answer from me, who cannot be moved by the *conclusion* made by those Divines, any farther than the Premisses here *produced* and *answerd*, have appeared to have *force* in them, and who have more largely examined *Salmasius* his exceptions heretofore, and was even now by them acknowledged so to have done, and nothing yet replied to my *answers*, and therefore must not for ever *turne* the same *stone*, begin the same task againe. Num. 1.

But for the conceit which is here cited from *Salmasius*, which I confesse I considered not so much before, as to make any reply to it, *viz.* That *these* Epistles *were written when Episcopacy, properly so called, came into the* Church, *and thus proved from hence, because in all his* Epistles *he speakes highly in honour of* Presbytery *as well as of Episcopacy, that so the people, that had been accustomed to the* Presbyterian Government, *might the more willingly and easily receive this new* 2.

Government by Episcopacy, and not be offended at the novelty of it. It is evident how easily this may be retorted, and the *argument* as firmely formed to conclude, that *Presbyters* were then *newly* come into the *Church*, and therefore to make the people *inclinable* to give them a willing *Reception*, without being *offended* at the *novelty* of them, he still speakes *highly* in honour of *Episcopacy*.

3. Such *Arguments* as these you will guesse from hence, how *incompetent* they are to conclude matters of *fact*, done so many *hundred* yeares agoe, (such is the *question*, whether *Ignatius* wrote these Epistles or no) It is much more probable that they wanted Arguments of any *reall* validity, who are faine to fly to such Succors as these.

4. Yet one farther *misadventure* there is, in forming or making use of this *conceit*; For what is said in those *Epistles* concerning the *honour* due to *Presbyters* or the *Presbytery*, is farre from looking favourably on the *Presbyterian Government*, for certainly as long as there is a *Bishop*, properly so called, set *over* the *Presbyters*, as they know there is in all those Epistles, and as long as the *Presbyters* are to do *nothing* without *commission* from him (as they knew also (and even now *quarrell'd* at it) that by him they are required to doe) there is little *shew* of the *Presbyterian modell* discernible, no whit more, than there was in *England* long before they *covenanted* to cast the *Bishops* out of the *Church*; It being certaine that no *community* or *equality* of *Presbyters* taken into *counsell* with the *Bishop*, doth constitute the *Government Presbyterian*, as long as there be any *Bishops* to have *power* over *Presbyters*; Else had the *Convocation* of *Deanes*, *Archdeacons* and *Clerks*, fourteen yeares agoe, been the *platform* of *Presbyterian Government* in *England*.

5. This is, I conceive, a full *answer* to every the most *minute* part or appearance of *Argument* here produced against these Epistles, and is all that was proper here to be said concerning *Ignatius*, whose Epistles as long as they have any *authority* with us, let it be in the most *Reformed*, *purified Edition*, that ever was, or can be hoped for, there is *evidence* enough for the *Apostolicall Institution* of *Bishops* in the

moderne notion of the word, And if after all this they must have no *authority*, for no other *crime*, but because they are such punctuall Asserters of this *Doctrine*; 'Tis to little purpose farther to examine or inquire, what *Antiquity* hath affirmed or practised in this matter.

Sect. V.

Testimonies of Irenæus, *The use of* Presbyteri *for* Bishops.

YEt because their Method leads us forward to consider some other of the Antient Writers, and I have promised so farre to comply with them, I shall now in the next place attend them to the view of two of those, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, p. 114. 115. where having acknowledged of them that they say that Apostles *made* Bishops *in* Churches, Polycarpe *in* Smyrna, Clemens *at* Rome, *&c.* all that they require of us to prove, is, that by the word *Bishop* is meant a *Bishop* as *distinct* from *Presbyters*, and the reason why they thinke this needs *proving*, is, because *both those Authors use the words* ἐπίσκοποι *Bishops*, and Πρεσβύτεροι, *Presbyteri, Seniores, for the same thing, the one calling* Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Telesphorus, Xystus, Presbyters *of the Church of* Rome *in his Epistle to* Victor; *the other calling the Presidents of the Churches* Seniores *in his Apologie, and some other places* are produced to the same purpose. Num. 1.

To this therefore I shall now briefly give answer, *i. e.* by *concession* that the same persons, who by these two Authors are called *Bishops*, are promiscuously called *Presbyteri* and *Seniores* also; And therefore secondly, that this *question* being thus farre (as to the *Names*) *equally* balanced betweene us, they saying that *Bishops*] signifies *Presbyters* in the *moderne* notion, we that *Presbyters*] signifies *Bishops* in the *moderne* notion, some other *Indications*, beside this of the *Names*, must be made use of on either side, toward the decision of it. 2.

Of this sort there is no one offered to us by them, and so 3.

as they have nothing to incline the *balance* their way, so we have nothing to make *answer* to in that particular. I shall therefore (as the onely thing left for me to doe) render some few Reasons, why the words *Bishop* and *Elders* in these Authors must needs signifie *Bishops* in our *Moderne* sense.

4. And the first *proofe*, as farre as concernes *Irenaeus*, is, because *Irenaeus*, who useth these words *promiscuously*, was himselfe a *Bishop* in our *moderne* notion, and yet is by others in his own dayes call'd *Elder* of the *Church* of *Lyons*, at that very time, when he is acknowleged to be *Bishop* of it, in our *moderne* sense of the word; This I thus manifest in each part.

5. And first, That *Irenaeus* was *Bishop* of *Lyons*, in such a
* L.5 c.23. sense, as we now use *Bishop*, appeares by what * *Eusebius* saith of him, importing that he was *Primate* of all *France*, τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικίων, ἃς Ἐρηναῖος ἐπισκόπει, saith he. he *was* Bishop *of the Provinces through France*: Now this, we know, cannot be affirm'd of a *moderne Presbyter*, who pretends not to any such *wide* and *singular jurisdiction*; And this needs no farther proofe, it being by D. *Blondell* in his *Apologie* for St. *Hierome* confest, that 140. yeares after *Christ*, i.e. nigh 40. yeares before this time, the *Government* of the *Church* was in the hands of *Bishops* over all the *World*, *one* in every *Church* set over all the rest of the *Church*.

6. For the second part then, that at that time, when he is thus an acknowleged *Bishop* and *Arch-bishop*, he is yet called πρεσβύτερος ἐκκλησίας, *Elder of the* Church, I appeale to the *Testimony* of the *Gallicane* Church, at that time; as it lies re-
† L.5, c. 4. corded in † *Eusebius*, where in an Embassy performed by him in the name of the *Martyrs* of *Lyons* to *Eleutherius* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, we have these words concerning him, Ταῦτα σοι τὰ γράμματα προετρεψάμεθα τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ κοινωνὸν Εἰρηναῖον κομίσαι, Πατὲρ Ἐλευθέρε, καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἔχειν σὲ αὐτὸν ἐν παραδόσει ζηλωτὴν ὄντα τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ χριστοῦ Εἴγαρ ἤδειμεν τόπον τινὶ Δικαιοσύνην περιποιεῖσθαι, ὡς Πρεσβύτερον ἐκκλησίας, ὥσπρ ἐστὶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἐν πρώτοις ἂν παρεθεμέθα. *We have intreated our Brother and partaker* Irenaeus *to beare these*

Letters

Letters to you, O Father Eleutherius, *and we beseech you to prize him as one very zealous of* Christ's *Covenant; If we thought that Justice would purchase a place to any, we had commended him in a principall manner, as* Elder *of the* Church, *for so he is.*

Here *nine* yeares after he had been *Bishop* and *Archbishop* of *Lyons*, about the *yeare* of *Christ* 177. he is styled by those *Letters*, *Elder* of the *Church*; by which it appeares that in his time *Elder* was the title of *Bishop*, in our *Moderne* sense, and consequently so it may fitly signifie in his *own* writings, and so must needs do there, when 'tis applied to those, who were acknowleged *Bishops* at that time, when by the *Presbyterians* acknowledgement *Episcopacy* was come in, in that notion, wherein we now understand it. 7.

A second proofe of this, is, that what in one place out of *Papias* he saith of all the *Seniores* or *Elders*, which in *Asia converst* with St. *John*, that *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who lived in the same time, affirmes of the *Bishops* or *Elders* of *Asia*; meaning by both of them the *Bishops* in our notion of the word. 8.

Clemens Alexandrinus wrote his *Stromata* about the yeare 192. which is *five* yeares before *Irenaeus Martyrdome*, in the 5. of *Severus*. Now of this *Clemens*, it is certaine, 1. That he acknowleged the three Orders in the Church, which he calls τὰς κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προκοπὰς, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, the three *degrees* or *promotions in the Church*, of Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, and consequently must by the word ἐπίσκοπος understand *Bishops* in our *moderne* sense. 9. Strom. 6.

Secondly, that when he makes the Relation of *John's* meeting with the *Bishops* of *Asia* (which is the same matter which *Irenaeus* produceth out of *Papias*) he calls them in the same period both *Elders* and *Bishops* indifferently, For speaking of St. *John* he hath this passage, Ἐλθὼν ἐν ἐπὶ τινὰ τῶν ἐν μακρὰν πόλεων — ἐπὶ πᾶσι τῷ καθεστῶσι προβλέψας ἐπισκόπῳ, νεανίσκον ἐδὼν, τοῦτον, ἔφη, σοι παρατίθομαι — ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερος ἀναλαβὼν οἴκαδε — *Coming to a City not farre off — and looking on the* Bishop, *which was constituted over all, seeing a young man,* 10.

man, he said, *This person I commit to thee.* — *And the Elder took him home, brought him up baptized, and at last gave him confirmation.*

11. Here it is evident this *Elder* of *Asia*, one of those which, in *Irenæus*, conversed with Saint *John*, is ἐπίσκοπος ὑπὸ πάσι καθεζόμενος, a *Bishop constituted over all* in that *City*; and agreeably when Saint *John* comes back that way againe, he calls to him by that title, Ω ἐπίσκοπε τὴν παραταθεῖσάν σοι παρακαταθήκην ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς σοὶ παρακατεθέμεθα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἧς προκάθῃ μένεις; *O* Bishop, *render us the* depositum, *which both I and Christ delivered to thee in the presence of the* Church, *over which thou art set.* Where againe he that is called *Elder* both by him and *Irenæus*, is also by him called ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησίας προκαθεζόμενος, the *Bishop set over the Church.* And so that is a second evidence of it.

12. *Thirdly*, In his *Epistle* to *Victor Bishop* of *Rome*, he speakes of his *Predecessors* thus, Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ πρὸ σοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς νῦν ἀρχῇ, Ἀνικήτος, Πίος, Ὑγῖνός τε, καὶ Τελέσφορος —*The* Elders *which were set over the* Church *which thou rulest*, Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, *and* Telesphorus, and lib. 3. cap. 3. Θεμελιώσαντες καὶ οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τῷ ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρισαν —*The blessed* Apostles *having founded and built the* Church *of* Rome, *put the* Episcopal *office into the hands of* Linus, Anacletus *succeeded him*, Clemens Anacletus, Evarestus Clemens, Alexander Evarestus, *then* Xystus *the sixt from the* Apostles, *after him* Telesphorus, *then* Hyginus, *then* Pius, *after him* Anicetus, *after* Anicetus, Soter; νῦν δωδεκάτῳ, τόπῳ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καλόχι κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερος, *Now in the twelfth place* Eleutherus *possesses the* Bishoprick *from the* Apostles.

13. Here 1. it is evident that every one first named as *Elders*, are yet *single persons*, one *succeeding* another, πρεσβύτερος ἐκκλησίας: *set over*, or *ruling the Church* of *Rome*: Secondly, That for *twelve successions* together they are by *Irenæus* lookt upon *all*, as of the same *ranke*, succeeding one another, and the *first* as well as the *last*, called *Bishop*, which must conclude it to be understood by him in such a *notion*, as is equally competible to *all*, and so must be in our *moderne* notion, if the great *Asserters*

ſerters of the *Presbyterian* cauſe ſay true, that about the yeare 140. *i. e.* certainly before *Eluthering* was *Biſhop* of *Rome*, there were *Biſhops* over *Presbyters* all the *world* over.

14. *Laſtly*, * *Irenæus*, ſpeaking of ſome unworthy *voluptuous Elders*, expreſſeth their faults in ſuch a manner, as cannot fitly belong to any but *Biſhops*, *Principalis conceſſionis tumore elati ſunt, they are puft up with the pride of the principall place*, the πρωτοκαθεδρια the *principall chair*, which as *Biſhops* belonged to them. For though it is as poſſible that *Presbyters* ſhould be guilty of the *pride*, the *tumour* and *elation*, as that *Biſhops* ſhould be guilty of the ſame, yet the *occaſion* of it there mentioned, the *principalis conſeſſio*, the *chiefe place* of *dignity*, is peculiar to the *one*, and not reconcileable with the ἰσοτιμία or *equality* of the *other*. * L. 4. c. 44.

15. Theſe evidences have readily offered themſelves to ſhew what *Irenæus* meanes by *Presbyteri*, when he uſeth that and *Biſhops* promiſcuouſly, viz. by both, *Biſhops* in our *moderne* notion, and he that ſhall reade over that *author* diligently, and compare his *dialect* with *Polycarpe* and *Papias*, with whom he accords, the former uſing πρεσβύτεροι for *Biſhops* (as hath largely been inſiſted on) and the latter for *Apoſtles* and *Biſhops*, *ſingle Governors* of each *Church*, (* πρεσβύτεροι ἀνδρες, Euſeb. l. 3. c. 39. Πέτρος, Ἀρίστιων, Ἰωάννης, and elſewhere πρεσβύτεροι Μάρκος. *Andrew*, *Peter*, *Ariſtion*, *John*, *Marke*, all *Elders*) will doubtleſſe finde many more proofes that thus he uſed the word, and (I ſhall adventure to undertake) meet with no one *indication* to the contrary.

Sect. V.

Teſtimonies of Tertullian. Seniores, & Majores natu *for Biſhops*, *ſo in* Firmilian.

AS for *Tertullian* I ſhall need ſay no more, but that it is the *confeſſion* of the great *Patron* of *Presbyterians*, that he doth *aperte tueri communi uſu receptam ordinis in Epiſcopos, Presbyteros & Diaconos, diſtinctionem. Openly defend the received common diſtinction of the Eccleſiaſtick order into* Biſhops, Num 1. D Blondel Apol. pag. 38.

Presbyters *and* Deacons, and he that can yet doubt of it, let him examine his *citations*, *de Præscript.* cap. 41. *de Baptismo* cap 17. *de Monogam.* cap. 11. *de Fuga* c. 11. And that *de Baptismo* as high & cleare, as that which was most quarrell'd with in *Ignatius*. *Dandi Baptismum jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est Episcopus, dein Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi authoritate, propter honorem Ecclesiæ, quo salvo salva pax est.* *The Bishop hath the right of giving Baptisme, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Bishop, for the honour of the Church, which being preserved, peace is preserved.*

2. So that of him it is as cleare, as of *Irenæus* or *Clemens*, that he must understand *Bishop* in our *Moderne* notion: And yet even by him, these of this *uppermost* degree are called *Seniores*, and *Majores natu*, Elders, *Præsident probati quique Seniores*, *the Elders præside*, *Apol.* c. 39. and of the *Bishops* of *Rome*, the *series* of whom he had brought downe to *Anicetus*, lib. 3. *contr. Marcion.* cap. 9. he expresses them by *Majores natu*, *successors of the Apostles*, in his Book, written in *verse*, against *Marcion*.

3. And there will be lesse wonder in this, when it is remembred that after this in Saint *Cyprian*'s times (who hath been sufficiently evidenced to speake of *Bishops* in our *moderne* notion of them) *Firmilian Bishop* of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, in vulgar style calls them *Seniores*, and *Præpositi*, *Elders*, and *Provosts*, in his *Epistle to Cyprian*, and againe *Præsident Majores natu*, &c. *the Elders præside*, evidently meaning the *Bishops* by those *titles*.

4. And so much be spoken in returne to what they have objected from these two *Antients*, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, supposing that I have competently performed the taske by them imposed on the *Prælatists*, shewed that the *Bishops* spoken of by them, were *Bishops* over *Presbyters*, and by them understood to be so.

Sect.

Sect. VI.

Saint Jerom's *Testimony of* Bishops, *&c. by Apostolicall Tradition.* Consuetudo *opposed to* Dominica dispositio. *Saint* Jerom's *meaning evidenced by many other* Testimonies *to be, that* Bishops *were instituted by the* Apostles. *So by* Panormitan *also. The* Testimonies *of* Isidore, *&c. the Councel of* Aquen, *and of* Leo *vindicated. Of* Ischyras's *Ordination. The testimony of the* Synod ad Zurrium, *and of the 4th Councel of* Carthage.

IN the next place I am to proceed to that of Saint *Hierome* in his 85. *Epistle ad Euagrium*, the *unanswerableness* of which I am affirmed to make matter of *Triumph* over D. *Blondel* and *Walo Messalinus*, *seeming to say, that it never can be answered, whereas say they, if I had been pleased to cast an eye upon the vindication—written by* Smectymnuus, *I should have found this answer—* Num. 1.

What this *answer* is, we shall see anon, In the meane it will be necessary to give a briefe account, what it was, which is called a *triumphing* over these *two learned* men. 2.

And first it is sufficiently knowne, what advantages the *defenders* of *Presbyters* conceive themselves to have from that *one Antient* writer, the *Presbyter* Saint *Hierome*: From him they have the *interpretation* of those *Scriptures*, which they thinke to be for their use, as that the word *Bishop* and *Presbyter* are all one in severall *texts* of *Scripture*, and both signifie *Presbyters*, and that the *Apostles* at first designed, *ut communi Presbyterorũ concilio Ecclesiæ gubernarentur, that the* Churches *should be governed by the common Councel of* Presbyters, and that it so continued till upon the *dissentions*, which by this meanes arose in the *Church*, it was judged more *prudent* and usefull to the preserving of *unity*, *ut unus superponeretur reliquis, that one should be set over the rest, and all the care of the Church belong to him*, And this, saith *Hierome*, *in toto Orbe decretum*, *decreed* and executed *over the whole world.* 3.

By whom this was conceived, by him to be thus *decreed*, he gives us not to understand in that place, nor in what *point* 4.

of time he thought it was done, but leaves us to *collect* both from ſome few *circumſtances*; as 1. that it was after *Schiſmes* entred into the *Church*, and one ſaid *I am Paul, I of Apollos*, &c. And if it were *immediately* after that, then the *Preſbyterians* will gaine but little by this *Patron*: For his whole meaning will be, that the *Apoſtles* firſt put the *Government* of *each Church* into the hands of *many*, but ſoon ſaw the *inconvenience* of doing ſo, and the *Schiſme* and *ruptures* conſequent to it, and changed it *themſelves*, and ſetled one *ſingular Biſhop* in the whole power of *Government* in every *Church*, to which very fitly *coheres* what *Clement* had ſaid, that *leſt new contentions ſhould ariſe about this ſingular dignity and authority* who ſhould *ſucceed* to it, they made a *roll* or *Catalogue* of thoſe, which in *vacancies* ſhould *ſucceed* in each *Church*.

5. That this was not, in *Hierome*'s opinion, done thus early in the *Apoſtles* time, the *Preſbyterians* think they may conclude from what he ſaith on *Tit.* 1. *Epiſcopi noverint ſe magis conſuetudine quam diſpoſitionis Dominicæ veritate Preſbyteris eſſe Majores, Let Biſhops know that their greatneſſe and ſuperiority over Preſbyters is held rather by cuſtome, than by Chriſts having diſpoſed it ſo.* But it is very poſſible that this may not prove the *concluſion*, which is thought to be inferred by it, For here *Conſuetudo, Cuſtome*, as oppoſed to *Chriſts diſpoſition*, may well ſignifie the *Practice* of the *Church* in the *later* part of the *Apoſtles* times, and ever ſince to S. *Hierome*'s days, and that may well be ſevered from all *command*, or *inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, & ſo *Jerom*'s opinion may well be this, that *Chriſt* did not *ordain* this *ſuperiority* of one *above* another, but left all in *common* in the *Apoſtles* hands, who within awhile, to avoid *Schiſm*, put the power in each *Church* in the hands of ſome *one ſingular perſon*.

6. And that this was *Hierome*'s meaning, I thought my ſelfe, in *charity* to him, obliged to thinke, both becauſe in this ſenſe his words would better agree with the *univerſal affirmation* of all *Orthodoxe Chriſtians*, that before him (and after him too, unleſſe thoſe *few* that took it on his *credit*) ſpeake of this matter, and alſo, becauſe if this be not his ſenſe, he muſt needs be found to *contradict* himſelfe, having elſewhere affirmed that the *three degrees* of *Biſhops, Preſbyters* and *Deacons* in the

Church

Church were of *Apoſtolicall tradition*, *i. e.* by the *Apoſtles* themſelves *delivered* to the *Church*.

And now before I proceed, I deſire the *ingennous Reader*, who is *contrary* minded, to conſider, what he can *object* to this *concluſion* of mine thus inferr'd concerning S. *Hierome*'s *opinion*, and conſequently what probability there is, that the *Preſbyterians* cauſe ſhould be ſuperſtructed on any *Teſtimony* of S. *Hierome*, ſuppoſing what I am next to demonſtrate, that the *three orders* are by him acknowledged to be *delivered* from the *Apoſtles*. 7.

And this is evident in his *Epiſtle* to *Euagrius*, where having againe delivered the *ſubſtance* of what hath been now cited from his *notes* on *Tit.* 1. he yet *concludes*, *Et ut ſciamus traditiones Apoſtolicas ſumptas de veteri teſtamento*, *Quod Aaron & filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt*, *hoc ſibi Epiſcopi & Presbyteri & Diaconi in Eccleſiâ vendicent*. *That we may know that the* Apoſtles traditions *are taken out of the* Old Teſtament, *we have this inſtance*, *that what* Aaron *and his* Sonnes *and the* Levites *were in the* Temple, *the ſame the* Biſhops *and* Presbyters *and* Deacons *challenge to themſelves in the* Church. Where theſe *three degrees* (and ſo the *ſuperiority* of *Biſhops* over *Presbyters*) are by him affirmed to be *traditions* of the *Apoſtles*. 8.

On occaſion therefore of inquiring into *Hierome*'s meaning (and becauſe this place ſo readily offered it ſelfe to expedite it) it was ſure very *reaſonable* to examine, and obſerve, what they which made moſt advantage of *Hierome*'s *authority*, ſhould be found to ſay to this *teſtimony* of his, for the *Apoſtolical tradition* of *three orders*. And among theſe, three principall perſons offered themſelves to our *conſideration*, D. *Blondell*, *Walo Meſſalinus*, or *Salmaſius*, and *Lud. Capellus*, every of them having newly written on this ſubject, and collected eſpecially what *Jerome* had ſaid of it. 9.

Of theſe three the laſt was ſoone diſcerned to have dealt moſt *prudently*, ſetting downe the other *teſtimonies* out of him, but wholly omitting this; The other two having not been ſo *wary*, made uſe of another *dexterity*, ſet downe the words, but deferr'd their obſervations on them, till ſome 10.

fitter season; D. *Blondell* put it off to his *sixt Section*, whereas upon examination he hath but *three* in his whole *booke*, and so is certainly never likely to speake of it, nor can be justly believed to have, in earnest designed any such thing: The other saith, he *expects more and better notes on it from* Salmasius (i.e. from himselfe) *in another booke*, viz. *De Ecclesiastico Ordine*, and after a great *volume* come out of that *subject* 8. or 9. yeares after, he yet never takes this place, or his own *promise* into consideration.

11. This was all that my search produced, and the taking notice of these *plaine* matters of *fact*, the behaviours of these men in that, which so much concern'd the whole *cause* to be taken notice of, and laid to *heart*, is all that was done by me, and which is styled by these a *triumphing over* those *learned Men*. And I hope there was little of *hard* measure, and as little of *insolence* in this.

12. Now because what these *learned* Men thus averted the doing, is yet here said to be done by *Smectymnuus*, and that *if I had cast an eye on the vindication—I should there have found that place of* Hierome's *answered*, I am now in the last place to obey their directions, and consider the *answer*, which from *Smectymnuus* they have set down for me.

13. And it is *twofold*, the first is a *civill denyall* that there is any *truth* in the words, *For*, say they, *It is hard to conceive how this imparity can be properly called an Apostolicall Tradition, when* Jerome, *having mentioned* John *the last of the* Apostles, *saith it was* postea, *that one was set over the rest*.

14. But is this the way of *answering* the place, or salving the *difficulty*? *Hierome* saith, *Bishops, Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the *Church* (that sure is this *imparity*) are an *Apostolicall Tradition*; and they *answer*, *It is hard to conceive how it can be properly so called*. What is this but to make *Hierom's* words (as soone as ever he saith any thing which accords not with their *interest*) as *unreconcileable* with truth, as with his *own* former *words*, which they had cited from him? And then how much kinder to *Hierome* was I than they, who thought it necessary to affix a *commodious* meaning to his former words, and *interpret consuetudo*] the *custome* of the *Church*

Church begun in the *Apostles* dayes, that so in thus saying, he might be *reconcileable* with himself, when he called *Episcopacy a tradition Apostolicall?*

As for the *reason*, which makes this so *hard* for them to *conceive* from *Hierome's* words, I believe it hath no *force* in it; For though after the mention of S. *John's* words in his second and third Epistle, he saith that [*postea, afterwards*] this *imparity* was introduced, yet this proves not his opinion to be, that it was not *Apostolicall tradition*; It might be done *after* the *writing* of those Epistles, and yet in St. *John's* time, *i. e.* before his *death*. And though I believe St. *Hierome* was mistaken, in thinking there were no *Bishops* till then (it would have had more *truth* in it, if he had said there were no *Presbyters* till then) yet for all that, I cannot doubt but this was his *opinion*, because as he no where saith any thing which is *contrary* to this, so here he saith *expresly* that it was *Apostolicall tradition*, which in his *opinion* it could not be, if it were not in the *Church*, in his *opinion*, before St. *John's* death. And so there is but little appearance of *validity* in their first *Answer*. 15.

And for their *second*, that is somewhat like the former, *viz.* that *with* Hierome *Apostolicall tradition and Ecclesiasticall custome are the same*. 16.

If this be true, then certainly I did not amisse in thinking that when *Hierome* used *consuetudo custome* in opposition to *Dominica dispositio*, Christ's *appointment* or *institution*, I ought to interpret *custome* in that place, by *Apostolicall Tradition* in the other. For how *Ecclesiasticall custome* with him, and *Apostolicall Tradition* should be the same, and yet *Ecclesiasticall custome* may not be interpreted by *Apostolicall tradition*, especially when the same man *affirmes* them both of the same thing, I confesse I cannot apprehend. 17.

But then secondly, because I must suppose, that by making them the *same*, *they* must meane to bring downe *Apostolicall tradition* to signifie *Ecclesiasticall custome*, not to advance *custome* to signifie *Apostolicall tradition* (in the same manner as when they make *Bishop* and *Elder* the same, they bring downe *Bishop* to signifie *Presbyter*, but will not allow *Elder* 18.

to

to signifie *Bishop*)that also will be worth *examining* a while.

19. And 1. Can there be any reason to imagine, that *Hierome* or any man should set down that for an *instance* of *Apostolicall tradition*, which the same person doth not believe to be *delivered* by the *Apostles*, but to be of a *latter* date? That which is *delivered* by the *Apostles*, and *received*, and *practiced* by the *Church*, may fitly be called a *custome of the Church*, without adding or specifying, that we meane the *Apostolicall Church*, because the *Apostles*, while they lived, were a *part* of the *Church*, and the following age was a *part* of the *Church* also. But can it be truly said, that that was delivered by the *Apostles*, which was onely *accustomed* in the *subsequent Church*, and not so much as introduced under the *Apostles*?

20. This certainly is another strange way of *interpreting* words or phrases quite contrary to all *Lexicons*, or to the *use* of such *words* or *phrases*, which unlesse they be *changed*, it is as much as to say, he that said *Tradition Apostolicall*, did not meane *Tradition Apostolicall*; And this sure will bring little credit to St. *Hierome*, on whose *authority* they so much depend in this matter.

21. As for their *proofe* of what they say, viz. because *the observation of Lent*, *which he saith*, ad Marcellum, *is* Apostolica traditio, *is* contra Luciferianos, *said by him to be* Ecclesiæ consuetudo,]that sure is not of *force* to conclude what they would have it, for it may be (or by him be deemed to be)both, an *Apostolicall tradition* and a *custome* of the *Church* too, it being very *ordinary* and *reasonable*, that what the *Apostles delivered*, the *Church* should also *accustome*, and *practice*. But could *both* these be said by him of that which he thought were but *one* of these? That is againe to make him *testifie* against his *conscience*, to say *Lent* was an *Apostolicall tradition*, and to *believe* it was not an *Apostolicall tradition*.

22. Here I shall not need *debate* whether the *observation* of *Lent* were *Apostolical*, or no; All that is necessary to insist on, is, whether Saint *Hierome*, that *said* it was such, *believed* it to be such, And if he be *mistaken* in his *beliefe*, then he may be as well mistaken in the meaning of those passages, which he

in-

interprets ſo, as is *uſefull* to, and in favour of the *Presbyterians*, as that πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, *Act.*20. were the *Presbyters* of the *Church* of *Epheſus*; that the Ἐπίσκοποι *Biſhops*, *Phil.* 1. are *Presbyters* of that one *Church* or *City*, and the like. For either of thoſe is but his *beliefe* or *perſwaſion* too, and the more *fallible* they finde him in *other* things, the leſſe *weight* they ought to lay on his *opinion* in this, and the leſſe *blame* on us, for departing from his *opinion*.

But having ſaid this πρὸς ἔνστασιν, for the *repelling* all force of their *objection*, I ſhall now adde ſome other *teſtimonies* out of Saint *Hierome*, and after them, *one argument*, *ad homines* undeniable, to *demonſtrate*, that it was indeed and without *queſtion* S. *Hierome*'s opinion, that *Biſhops* in our *moderne* notion were *inſtituted* by the *Apoſtles* themſelves. 23.

1. In his 54. *Epiſtle* he ſets downe this difference among others, between the *Catholikes* and the *Montaniſt hereticks*, *Apud nos Apoſtolorum locum tenent Epiſcopi, apud eos Epiſcopus tertius eſt*, *Among the* Catholikes *the* Biſhops (ſuch as were in S. *Hierome*'s time, *i. e.* certainly ſuch as in ours not *mere Presbyters*) *hold the place of the* Apoſtles (*i. e.* the *uppermoſt* place in the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and *ſucceed* the *Apoſtles* in it) *and among thoſe* Hereticks *the* Biſhop *is the third*, which it ſeems was one *character* of their being *Hereticks*, and ſo a *deviation* from an *Apoſtolical* truth.) 24.

2. In his *Booke*, *de ſcript. Eccleſ.* he ſaith of *James* the *brother* of the *Lord*, *Jacobus ab Apoſtolis ſtatim poſt aſcenſionem Domini Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopus ordinatus, ſuſcepit eccleſiam Hieroſolyma*, *Timotheus à Paulo Epheſiorum Epiſcopus ordinatus*, *Titus Creta*, *Polycarpus à Johanne Smyrna Epiſcopus Ordinatus*, James *preſently after Chriſts Aſcenſion*, *Was ordained Biſhop of* Hieruſalem, *and undertook* (i. e. *ruled*, as to *receive the Congregation*, *Pſal.* 75. is to *rule* it) *the Church of* Hieruſalem, Timothy *Was ordained Biſhop of the* Epheſians *by* Paul, Titus *of* Crete, Polycarpe *was by* John *ordained Biſhop of* Smyrna. Where, as it is evident, and by the *Presbyterians* acknowledged, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were *ſingular rulers* (which therefore they are wont to excuſe by ſaying they are *extraordinary officers* or *Evangeliſts*) and yet by him ſaid to be *Biſhops* of 25.

Ephesus and *Crete*, and so constituted by the *Apostles*, so it is consequent that *James* and *Polycarpe* were by him deemed *singular rulers* also (and not *Collegues* in a *Presbytery*) and those so *constituted* by the *Apostles* also, and accordingly of this *James* he saith, *ad Gal. 2. Jacobus primus ei Ecclesiæ præfuit—Episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit*, James *was the first that was set over that Church—was the first Bishop of* Hierusalem. And in consequence thereto in his *comments* on *Isa. lib. 5. cap. 17.* he calls this *James Decimum tertium Apostolum the thirteenth Apostle*

26. 3. In like manner * *Epist. ad Euagrium*, speaking of *Marke* (who dying in the 8th. of *Nero*, what was done by him, must be resolved to have been in the *Apostles* times, and agreeable to their *practice*] he saith, *Alexandriæ à Marco Evangelistâ ad Heraclam & Dionysium Episcopos Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori super Presbyteros gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret.* *At* Alexandria *from the time of* Marke *the Evangelist, to the time of* Heraclas *and* Dionysius *Bishops, the Presbyters always named one chosen from among themselves, and placed in an higher degree above Presbyters, their Bishop, as if an army should choose their Generall.* That what is said of the *Presbyters choosing* their *Bishop*, belongs not to *Presbyters imposing hands* on him, is * elsewhere largely evidenced. And so, by the way, appeareth the *falsenesse* of the citation out of *Jerome, Appen. p. 142.* that *in Alexandria for a long time the Presbyters ordained* (it should have been said *elected*) *their Bishop*. That which I here inferre from the *testimony* is manifest, *viz.* that in Saint *Markes* time, and from the *first* planting of the *Church* at *Alexandria*, one *Bishop* or *singular Ruler* was *constituted* among them, as that signifies an *higher degree* than that of *Presbyters*.

* Pag. 85.

* Dissert. 3. cap 10.

27. 4. More places there are in him, which evidence his opinion, that *Bishops*, as they differ from *Presbyters*, are *successors* of the *Apostles*: In his *Comment* on *Psal. 45. Nunc quia Apostoli à mundo recesserunt, habes pro his Episcopos filios, sunt & hi patres tui, quia ab ipsis regeris.* *Now* (in *S. Hierome's* time) *because the* Apostles *are parted from the world, you have in their*

stead

ſteads Biſhops *their* Sonnes; *They alſo are thy* Fathers, *becauſe thou art governed by them.* Where the *Biſhops* that *then* ruled (thoſe are confeſt to be *ſingle* perſons, not *Presbyteries*) are the *ſucceſſors* of the *Apoſtles* in his opinion. And *Ep.* 1. *ad Heliodorum*, of not *undertaking* the *office* of *Biſhop*. *Non eſt facile ſtare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri*; 'tis not eaſie to ſtand *in* Pauls *place, to hold the degree of* Peter. Where *Epiſcopacy* is the *place* and *degree* of thoſe *Apoſtles*. And ſo *Ep.* 13. *ad Paulinum, Epiſcopi & Presbyteri habeant in exemplum Apoſtolos & Apoſtolicos viros, quorum honorem poſſidentes habere nitantur & meritum, Biſhops and Presbyters muſt have for their Examples the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical men, whoſe honour they poſſeſſe, and therefore ought to endeavour to imitate their merit.*

5. I ſhall adde a *Cumulus* of other paſſages much to the ſame purpoſe with the former, and fit to be taken in conjunction with them, to give us the full underſtanding of S. *Hierome's* opinion in this matter. *Ad Nepotian. Ep.* 2. *Eſto ſubjectus Pontifici tuo, & quaſi anima parentem ſuſcipe, quod Aaron & filios ejus, hoc Epiſcopum & Presbyteros eſſe noverimus. Be ſubject to the* Biſhop, *and receive him as the parent of thy* Soule, *what* Aaron *and his Sonnes were, that we muſt know the* Biſhop *and* Presbyters *to be.* And on *Tit.* 1. ſpeaking of S. *Paul's* directions for the making a *Biſhop*, *Apoſtolus*, ſaith he, *Eccleſiæ Principem formans, the Apoſtle forming the Prince* or *ruler of the Church*, and ſo againe in the ſame words on *Pſal.* 45. deciphering a *ſingle ruler* by that *Biſhop*, which the *Apoſtle* there meant to *forme*. So on that 45. *Pſal. Conſtituit Chriſtus in omnibus finibus mundi Principes Eccleſiæ Epiſcopos, Chriſt in all parts of the world conſtituted Princes of the Church, the Biſhops*, juſt the ſame as hath beene cited from *Ignatius*, that *all the world over, the Biſhops were ordained by the Apoſtles according to the minde of Chriſt.* In his *Dial. adv. Luciferian. Eccleſiæ ſalus in ſummi ſacerdotis dignitate pendit, cui ſi non exors quadam & ab omnibus eminens detur poteſtas, tot in Eccleſiis efficientur Schiſmata quot ſacerdotes*; and, *Si quaris quare in Eccleſiâ baptizatus, niſi per manus Epiſcopi non accipiat Spiritum ſanctum—diſce hanc obſervationem ex ea auctoritate deſcendere, quod Spiritus ſanctus ad Apoſtolos deſcendit. The ſafety of* 28.

the Church depends on the dignity of the chiefe Priest (or *Bishop*) *to whom, if a peculiar power be not given above all that others have, there will be as many Schisms as Priests in the Churches —If you demand why he that hath been baptized in the Church, may not receive the Holy Ghost but by the hands of the Bishop, learne that this observance descends from that Authority, in that the holy spirit descended on the Apostles* Which *Testimony*, as it shewes the necessity of a *singular Bishop* to avoid *Schisms* in the *Church*, and so must affixe the *institution* of them on the *Apostles*, who made *provision* against that danger (and that I suppose is his meaning in * that place which the *Presbyterians* make most use of) so it *directly* derives the *authority*, by which *Bishops* stand in the *Church*, *distinct* from *Presbyters*, and *above* them from the *descent* of the *Holy Ghost* on the *Apostles*. Lastly, *adv. Jovinian.* l. 1. *Episcopus & Presbyter & Diaconus non sunt meritorum nomina sed officiorum. Nec dicitur, si quis Episcopatum desiderat—The Bishop and Presbyter and Deacon, are names of offices, neither is it said, If any man desire a Bishoprick*—applying those *Texts* of Saint *Paul*, concerning the *qualifications* of *Bishops* to the *Bishop*, as in his time he stood, *distinct* from *Presbyters*.

* *In toto orbe decretum ut unus de Presbyteris electus supponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret, ut schismatum semina tollerentur*, and *Paulatim ut dissensionum semina tollerentur, ad unum omnis sollicitudo delata est.* Com ad Tit.

29. All this I suppose may suffice to give *authority* to my *collection* and *conclusion* from *plaine* words of Saint *Hierome*, that his meaning was as *plaine* and undubitable, that *Episcopacy* was *delivered* downe and *instituted* in the *Church* by the *Apostles* themselves. And I cannot conceive what can be invented to avoid the *evidence* of these *testimonies*; yet because I promised it, I shall now adde that *one argument* (*ex abundanti*, and much more than is *necessary*) to the same purpose, (*viz.* to prove that this was *Hierome's* meaning, which I pretend it to be.) And that such, as by these *objectors* cannot with *justice* be denyed, to have a full irrefragable force in it, having themselves made use of it *against* us, which they ought not to have done, if by *themselves* it shall now be *denyed* when it is *produced* by us.

30. In the close of their *Appendix*, they have set downe several *propositions declaring the judgement and practice of the Antient Church about ordination of Ministers*, and their *first proposition*, being

being this, that *in the first and purest times—there was ordination of Presbyters without Bishops over Presbyters*, their *proofe* is this. *For these Bishops came in* postea *and* paulatim, *afterward, and by little and little as* Jerome *saith. And* Panormitan, *lib.* 1. *Decretal. de Consuetud.* cap. 4. *saith Olim Presbyteri in communi regebant Ecclesiam & ordinabant sacerdotes, & pariter conferebant omnia sacramenta. Of old the Elders ruled the Church in common, and ordained Priests, and joyntly conferred all the Sacraments.*

These two *testimonies* of *Hierome* and *Panormitan*, being brought to prove the same *proposition* concerning *ordination* by *Presbyters*, and the time of *Bishops coming* in to the *Church*, It must sure be reasonable to resolve that what *Panormitan* hath defined in this matter, that was Saint *Hieromes* sense also; Now what that is, will be discerned by setting downe *Panormitane's* words at large, as they lye in the place cited by them. 31.

The businesse he hath there in hand is to *prove* that *custome* is not of *force* so farre, as to *prescribe* that an *Ordinary Clerk* as *Presbyter* should *performe* an *Episcopal act*, *Ea quæ sunt ordinis Episcopalis non possunt acquiri per ordinem inferiorem ex consuetudine quantamcunque vetustissimâ. Those things that are of Episcopal order cannot by any custome, how antient soever, be acquired by any Inferiour order.* The reason is, *quia consuetudo non facit quem capacem, because custome doth make no man capable* —Then he makes this *observation*, that *Ritus Apostolorum circa sacramenta habent impedire characteris impressionem; The rites*, or *practice*, or *institutions of the Apostles about the Sacraments, have power to hinder the impression of the Character, nam immediate post mortem Christi omnes Presbyteri in communi regebant ecclesiam, non fuerant inter ipsos Episcopi, sed idem Presbyter quod Episcopus, & pariter conferebant omnia sacramenta, sed postmodum ad Schismata sedanda fecerunt seu ordinaverunt Apostoli, ut crearentur Episcopi, & certa sacramenta iis reservarunt, illa interdicendo simplicibus Presbyteris—For immediately after the death of Christ, all the Elders in common ruled the Church, and so there were no Bishops among them, but a Presbyter was the same that a Bishop, and they joyntly conferred all the Sacraments. But* 32.

after a while for the appeasing of Schismes the Apostles caused or ordained that Bishops *should be created, and reserved to them some Sacraments (or holy Rites) forbidding single* Presbyters *to meddle with them*: *and he concludes,* Et vides hic quod talis ordinatio habet impedire etiam impressionem Characteris, quia si Presbyteri illa de facto conferunt, nihil conferunt, *and here you see, that such an Ordination is able to hinder the impression of the Character, because if* Presbyters *doe* de facto *confer them, they confer nothing.*

33. Where, as *Panormitan* cited by them to prove *Ordination* without *Bishops* (and specious words pickt out of him to that purpose) doth yet distinctly *affirme* that *Presbyters*, which *confer Orders* without a *Bishop conferre nothing*, all their *Ordinations* are meere *nullities* (and what could have been said more *severely* against their *practice*, and their *designe* in citing him, than this?) so he plainly interprets St. *Jeromes* assertion of the *occasion* and time of *Bishops* being set over the *Presbyters*, that it was done by the appointment of the *Apostles* themselves, and so that *consuetudo*, *custome* in *Jerome*, opposed to *Dominica dispositio Christ's disposall*, is no more than [*post modum ordinaverunt Apostoli*, *after a while the* Apostles *ordeined*] opposed to [*immediatè post mortem Christi, immediately after the death of Christ.*]

34. And then by the way, as the *Reader* may hence discerne what force there is, in this *Testimony* of *Panormitan* to support their *first proposition* concerning the *Ordination* of *Presbyters without* Bishops *over* Presbyters (for which besides St. *Jeromes postea* and *paulatim*, and part of this *testimony* of *Panormitan*, they produce no other) and as by what was formerly said of the *Testimonies* of *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, their chiefe supports for their * *second proposition*, have already been utterly demolished, so also the *Testimonies* of *Isidore Hispalensis* and the *Councell* of *Aquen* produced for the proofe of their † *third Propositon*, concerning the *Presbyters* having an *intrinsick* power to ordaine Ministers, will immediately vanish in like manner. For as it is evident that that place in that *councell* of *Aquen* is for nine Chapters together transcribed out of *Isidore*, and consequently the

* *Append.p.129*

† *Append.p.131.*

Te-

Teſtimonies out of *him* and that *councell* are but *one* and the ſame thing, twice repeated, to increaſe the *number*, ſo 'tis as evident that what is by them ſaid, is taken from St. *Hierome*, and can no farther be extended either in reſpect of the *authority* or the *matter* of the *Teſtimony*, than in St. *Hierome* it hath appeared to extend. And therefore as the * words cited by theſe men out of them are no more than theſe, that *ſo'um propter authoritatem Clericorum ordinatio & conſecratio reſervata eſt ſummo ſacerdoti*, *That Preſbyters have many things common with* Biſhops, *onely in reſpect of authority* (or for the preſerving it intire, and the *unity* of each *Church*, which depended on that, in St. *Hierom's* opinion) *the Ordination and conſecration of* Clerks (*i.e.* of all *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) *was reſerved to the chiefe Prieſt*, i.e. the *Biſhop*; which how farre it is from *concluding* what it was brought to *prove*, the *intrinſick* power of *Presbyters* to *ordaine Miniſters*, I leave to any *Reader* to paſſe judgement. And yet truly this doth it as well as their *one* other *antient Teſtimonie*, that of *Leo*, ſet out in their front, out of his 88. *Epiſtle*, concerning the *Conſecration* of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and ſome other things, *Quæ omnia ſolis deberi Pontificibus authoritate canonum præcipitur*, *All which that they ſhould be due to the* Biſhops *and to none elſe, it is commanded by the authority of the Canons.* Who would ever have thought fit from ſuch words as theſe, which *affirme* this *privilege* to be *reſerved peculiarly* to the *Biſhops*, and that the *authority* of the *Canons* ſo requires, to conclude that the *Preſbyters* had this *intrinſick power*; As if all that the *Canons* deny *Presbyters*, were infallibly their *due* to enjoy, and the *Argument demonſtrative*, that it *was* their *Originall* and *intrinſick due*, becauſe the *Canons deny* it.

Append p.132.

What they adde of *Iſchyras* Prop. 6. that *being depoſed from being a* Presbyter, *becauſe made by* Colluthus *who was but a* Presbyter *himſelfe, and not a* Biſhop, *this was done, not becauſe the act of* Colluthus *was againſt the* Canon *of Scripture, but onely becauſe it was againſt the* Canons *of ſome councels.*] is ſomewhat of the ſame nature with the *former*, and will be beſt judged of by the relation of the *Fact*, which in the *ſtory*

35. P. 143.

of

of those times is thus made by *Socrates*, Πρόγμα ὑπέδυ πόλλων θανάτων ἄξιον οὐδεπώποτε γὰρ ἱερωσύνες τυχὼν τὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου ὄνομα ἑαυτῷ περιθέμενος τὰ ἱερέως πράττειν ἐτόλμησεν, *He adventured on a thing worthy of many Deaths, for being never admitted to the* Priesthood, *and assuming to himselfe the name of an* Elder, *he dared to doe the things belonging to a* Priest. A *censure* which certeinly sets the fault somewhat higher than the *transgressing* of the Canons of some Councels.

L. 1. c. 20.

36. Two *Testimonies* more I shall touch on, before I returne to the pursuit of my proposed Method, and then I shall render the reason of this *Excursion*.

37. For the confirmation of their *second Proposition* concerning *Ordination*, one *Testimony* they produce from the *Synod ad Quercum* Ann. 403. *where it was brought as an accusation against Chrysostome*, ὅτι πόλλους ἁμαρτύρους ἐχειρατόνησεν, ὅτι ἄνευ συνεδρίου καὶ παρὰ γνωμὴν τοῦ κλήρου ἐποίησε τὰς χειροτονίας, *That he made Ordinations without the company and sentence of the Clergy*. Another from the *councell* of *Carthage* Can. 20. *Ut* Episcopus sine Concilio Clericorum suorum non ordinet, *That a* Bishop *ordeine not* Clerkes *without the Councell of his owne* Clerkes, and *Can.* 2. Cum Ordinatur *Presbyter* Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes *Presbyteri* qui præsentes sunt manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant. *When a* Presbyter *is Ordeined, as the* Bishop *blesseth him and layes his hand on his head, let all the* Presbyters *also that are present lay their hands on his Head by the Hand of the Bishop*. And the conclusion deduced from these *Testimones* (and the forementioned of *Cyprian* and *Fermilian*) is this, that *Ordination by* Bishops *without the assistance of his* Presbyters *was alwayes forbidden and opposed*. How truly this is inferred from the *Præmisses* will soone be judged by a view of the *Testimonies*.

38. For the first, this is the truth of the Story, *Theophilus* a guilty person, and as such, cited to answer, what was *objected* against him, making use of the *envy*, under which *Chrysostome* then laboured, shifted the *Scene*, and becamse his *judge*, nay, as *Photius* tells us, he and the rest of that *Conventicle*,

venticle, οἱ τὰ μαλιστὰ δυσμενῶς ἔχοντες πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα, *that were* Chrysostome's *greatest enemies*, ἅμα πάντα καὶ κρῖται, καὶ κατήγοροι, καὶ μάρτυρες ἦσαν, *were at once Judges, and Accusers, and Witnesses of all that was charged against him.* And therefore we already see, what heed is to be given to the *accusation* of those *Fathers ad quercum*, and how *valid* an argument can be deduced from it; And we shall the better guesse at it, if we consider also, what other *particulars* were, in the same manner that this was, *charged* against him, set downe by *Photius* in his *Bibliotheca*. The 23. charge was, ὅτι αὐτῷ μόνῳ λουτρὸν ὑποκαίεται—*that the Bath was heated for him alone, and that after he had bathed*, Serapion *shuts the passage into the Bath, that no body else might bath: The* 25. ὅτι μόνος ἐσθίει,—*that he ate alone, living like one of the Cyclopes*, and betwixt these two new found crimes, comes in this, in the midst, being the 24. ὅτι πόλλους ἀμαρτύρους ἐχειροτόνησεν, *that he ordained many that had no Testimonialls*; which being set down by *Photius*, as the summe of that *charge*, referres us indeed to the *ground*, on which their *charge* was built, of his *ordaining without a Councell*, and *against the minde of his Clergy*, (those *testimonialls*, and so the *approbation* of the person by the *Clergy* being generally a good *preparation* to the receiving Orders) but doth not at all *prove* that a *Bishop* might not *ordaine* without *assistance* of his *Presbyters*, or that it was *alwayes forbidden*, any more than it proves that *eating* or *bathing alone* was *alwayes forbidden* also.

As for that of the 4. *Councell* of *Carthage* Can. 20. They have set downe but *halfe* the *Canon*; the *whole* runnes thus, *Ut Episcopus sine concilio Clericorum non ordinet, ita ut civium conniventiam & Testimonium quærat, That the* Bishop *ordain not without his councell of* Clergy, *so that he seeke the liking and testimoniall of the Inhabitants.* Which againe onely serves to shew, the use of the *assistent Presbyters*, to helpe the *Bishop* to a due *knowledge* of the person to be *ordained* (and this they know we *Prælatists* assent to and approve of) but is no argument of the *unlawfulnesse* of *sole ordination*, or of any *power* that the *Presbyters* have in the *conferring* of *Orders*. 39.

40. So likewise that from *Can.* 2. is onely a *Testimony* for the *fitnesse* and *usefulnesse* of that *custome* (still retein'd and used in our *Church* in all *Ordinations* of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) that the *Presbyters* there *present* should *lay* on their *hands* by the *hand* of the *Bishop*, and so joyne in the *Prayer* or *benediction*, but no proofe that a *Presbyter* might not be *ordeined* by a *Bishop* without the *presence* of such *Presbyters*.

41. I have for a while gone aside from the consideration of S. *Hierome's testimony* (the designed matter of this *Section*) and allowed my selfe *scope* to take in all the *testimonies* of *Antiquity*, which are made use of by these *Assemblers*, for the justifying their *Ordination* of *Ministers*; And I have done it on purpose (though a little contrary to my designed Method and brevity) because after the publishing of the *Dissertations* against *Blondel*. I remember I was once told, that though it was not *necessary*, yet I might do well to add some *Appendix*, by way of *Answer* to that one head of *discourse* concerning *Presbyteriall Ordination*, and the Instances which were objected by him. For which reason I have now, as neer as I can, taken in all, in this place, which are in their *Appendix* produced on that head, and doe not elsewhere in this *briefe* reply, fall in my way to be answered by me. For some others, mentioned by D. *Blondel*, I refer the *Reader* to the learned paines of the *Bishop* of *Derry*, in his vindication of the Church of *England* from the aspersion of *Schisme*, p. 270. *&c.*

42. And so being at last returned into my rode againe, This may, I hope, suffice to have said in the justification of what was done in the *Dissertations* concerning St. *Hierome*, both to cleare his sense, and for the setting the *ballance* aright betwixt his authority on the one side, and the authority of *Ignatius* on the other, betwixt some doubtfull sayings of the former, which seemed to *prejudice* the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles* instituting *imparity*, which yet elsewhere he *affirmes* to be Apostolicall tradition, and the many cleare and *uncontradicted*, constant sayings of the latter, which are acknowleged to assert it. Which one thing, if it be not in the *Dissertations* so done,

as

as may satisfie any *impartiall Judge*, that *Ignatius*, in full concord with all, is to be heeded on our side, more than St. *Hierome*, in some *few* of his many Testimones, can be justly *produced* against us, I shall then confesse my selfe guilty of over-much *confidence*; but if therein I have not erred, it is most evident that I need not undertake any farther *travaile* in this whole matter.

Sect. VII.

The Testimonies of Ambrose *and* Austin. Consignare *used for consecrating the* Eucharist, *and that belonged to the* Bishop *when present.*

THere now followes in the next place the passage cited by them p. 133. out of *Ambrose* on *Eph.* 4. where to prove that even *during the prevalency of Episcopacy 'twas not held unlawfull for a* Presbyter *to ordeine without a* Bishop, they urge out of St. *Ambrose* these words, *Apud Ægyptum* Presbyteri *consignant, si presens non sit Episcopus, In* Ægypt *the* Presbyters *consigne, if the* Bishop *be not present.* And the like out of *Austine* (or whosoever was the *Author*) *in Quæst. ex utroque Testam. Qu.* 101. *In* Alexandria *& per totam* Ægyptum, *si desit Episcopus, consecrat* Presbyter, *In* Alexandria *and through all* Ægypt, *if the* Bishop *be wanting, the* Presbyter *consecrates.* And having done so, they adde, *which words cannot be understood (as a — defender of Prelacy would have them) of the Consecration of the* Eucharist; *For this might be done by the* Presbyter *præsente Episcopo, the* Bishop *being present, but it must be understood either of confirmation, or (which is more likely) of ordination, because* Ambrose *in that place is speaking of Ordination.* Num. 1.

To this I shall briefly reply, 1. That it is sure enough, & granted by the most *eminent Presbyterians*, that these two Books, whence these *Testimonies* are cited, were not written either by *Ambrose* or *Austine*, but by some other (*Hilarius Sardus*, saith *Blondel*) and unjustly inserted among their *works*, and then the authority of such *supposititious* pieces will not be 2.

great to over-rule any *practice* otherwise *acknowledged* in the *Church* of *God*.

3. Secondly, that the mistakes of *Blondel* and *Salmasius*, concerning the meaning of the former of these places, were so evidently discovered by the *second* of them (the *consignant* in the one, interpreted by *consecrat* in the other) that I conceived it sufficient, but to name them; For can there be any thing more *unquestionable* than this, that *consecrare* in *antient* writers signifies the *Consecration* of the *Eucharist*? And then if *consignare* be a more *obscure* phrase, is there any doubt, but it must be *interpreted* by that which is so much more *vulgar* and *plaine*? and all the *circumstances* besides being exactly the same in both places, what doubt can there be, but in both, the words are to be understood of the *Eucharist*?

4. Yet because some advantage was by this their misunderstanding sought to the *Presbyterians* cause, they now resolve, and insist, that it must not be *rectified*, though they know not which to apply it to, *Confirmation* or *Ordination*, and pretend not to produce any *Testimony*, where *consecrare* is ever used for the *latter*, or *consignare* for either of them. And indeed * *Blondel* and † *Salmasius* were yet more *uncertaine*, for they thought it might also belong to the *benediction* of *Penitents*, and that as *probable* as either of the two former; And when the truth is rejected, thus it is wont to be.

* *Apol. p. 57.*
† *Appar. ad. lib. de Prim.*

5. As for the onely *reason* which inclines them to confine it to *Ordination*, *because* Ambrose *in that place is speaking of Ordination*, if the place be review'd, it will not be found to have *truth* in it; He speakes immediately before of the severall *Ministeriall Acts*, *Preaching* and *Baptizing*, adding indeed that *Scripta Apostoli non per omnia conveniunt Ordinationi, quæ nunc in Ecclesia est*, *The writings of the Apostle doe not in all things agree to the Order, which is now in the Church*. There is mention of *Ordinatio* indeed, but that signifies not *Ordination*, as we now use it for *ordaining* of *Ministers*, but manifestly the διατάξις, the *rule*, or *order* used in the *Church*, in severall respects, saith he, different from what it was in the *writings* of the *Apostle*.

And

And for their *objection* againſt my *interpretation*, that it cannot be underſtood of *conſecrating* the *Euchariſt*, [*becauſe this the* Presbyter *might doe when the* Biſhop *was preſent*] If they would have taken notice of the many evidences brought by me in that place out of the *Antients*, the Canons of the *Apoſtles*, *Ignatius ad Magneſ.* the 56 Canon of the *councell* of *Laodicea*, and *Tertullian*, that the *Presbyter* might not *adminiſter* either *Sacrament* without the *Biſhop's appointment*, and diſtinctly of this *Sacrament*: *Non de aliorum quam de Præſidentium manu Euchariſtiam ſumimus*, *we receive it not from the hands of any but the Præſidents*, i. e. (in his ſtyle) the *Biſhops*, *Tertull: de Cor. Mil.* they could never have thought this a *reaſonable Objection*, It being evidently the ſenſe of the Antient Canons, (to which the *deſcription* of the *practice* in *Juſtin Martyr* doth perfectly agree, *Apol.* 2.) that onely the *Biſhop* had power to *conſecrate* the *Euchariſt*, and in his *abſence* onely, the *Preſbyter*, to whom he gave that power. 6.

Had they been pleaſed to have taken notice of theſe *Canons* and *antient Records*, punctually ſet downe by mee in that place, it muſt certainly have prevented this their exception, and utterly robbed them of thoſe two *Teſtimonies* to that *Propoſition*. And as to that of the *Alexandrian Biſhops* out of *Hierome*, that is alſo largely anſwered by me, *Diſſert.* 3 c. 10. but that againe they were reſolved not to take notice of. 7.

Sect. VIII.

Of the Chorepiſcopi.

THere ſtill remaines one mention of me, upon occaſion of the *Chorepiſcopi* or *Regionary Biſhops*, *Append.* p. 138. Of that ſubject they are ſomewhat *large*, and ſo D. *Blondel* had been before them; and in *anſwering* him, all their *pretenſions* from thence, and that whole argument (by them purſued *P.* 135. 136. 137. 138.) is punctually anſwered, before it was produced, *Diſſert.* 3, c. 8. Num. 1.

2. And yet they go on roundly, as if there were no such thing, onely in the *close* they adde, *There is another whom we forbeare to name, that saith that the Chorepiscopi were* Bishops. *But hee addes, though they were* Bishops, *yet they were made but by one* Bishop, *and* Bishops *meerly titular and* sine Cathedrâ, *which is all one as if he should say, they were not properly Bishops.*

3. That which is said of the *Chorepiscopi* in the *Dissertations* is too long to be here so impertinently repeted, If the *Reader* please to consult the place, I have no *feare* that he will returne unsatisfied in any thing that is by these men *objected* against *Prelacy* from that head. A *Dilemma* is there used, which, whether they were *Bishops* or no, will certainly *secure* us.

4. As to their *present argument* against me, I *answer*, that what I say of those *Chorepiscopi*, is, not that they were *Bishops meerly titular*, but that they were *Proxies* or *vicarii* of the *Bishop* of the *City*, acting by *Commission* from him in the *Region* or *Countrey*, and were under the *Bishop* of the *City* and *Ordained* by him, and so were true *Bishops*, but not of the *Cities*, had *Ordination* as other *Bishops* had, though *three Bishops* were not by the *Canon* required to the *ordaining* of such, but onely that one *Bishop* of the *City*, whose *Proxy* or *Vicarius* the *Chorepiscopus* was: *Bishops* in cases of *necessity*, *ordained* sine titulo, *without a title* or *City* to which they were *affixt*, and for some time allowed to *ordaine Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the Countrey, and to doe some other things in the *Bishop's* stead.

5. All which is so largely set downe in the *Dissertations*, and vindicated so absolutely from serving the *Presbyterians* interest, that I must not for ever doe the same thing againe, *transcribe* what is there said abundantly, and nothing here *objected* against it, but that what I *affirme* of them, makes them to be not poperly *Bishops*. Where if by properly *Bishops* they meane *Bishops* of *Cities*, they say very true, for I affirme them to be, as their title assures me they were, *Regionary Bishops*, *Vicarii* and *Proxies* to the *City Bishop*.

But

But that they were *mere Presbyters*, and no more, and by their being *Presbyters* had the *Power* to *Ordeine* other *Presbyters* (which alone is the *Presbyterians* taske to make good, if they will have it usefull to the proofe of their *conclusion*, their * 4. *Proposition*, *That* Presbyters, *during the Prevalency of* Episcopacy, *had not onely an inherent power of Ordination, but in some cases did actually ordeine*) this they doe not undertake to make good against the discourse in the *Dissertations*; And therefore I have no *excuse* to make any larger *reply* to them. 6.

* *Append p.* 133

The Conclusion.

I Have now gone through every part of my designed Method, *and not omitted one* intimation *of theirs, wherein I could thinke my selfe concerned; And that it may appeare that I should not have* chosen *this, as a* season, *to begin any* debate *concerning a* subject *so forgotten in men's minds as* Episcopacy *is, I shall thus conclude the* Readers *trouble, without examining what else they say on this* subject, *having, I hope, competently* secured *my selfe from the Opinion of having formerly* attempted *to seduce any, so little either to his or my owne* advantage.

THE END.

The *Printer* to the *Reader*.

THe absence of the Author, and his inconvenient distance from London, hath occasioned some lesser escapes in the impression of this Volume &c. The Printer thinks it the best instance of pardon if his Escapes be not laid upon the Author, and he hopes they are no greater than any discreet understanding may amend, thus,

PAge 5. l. 25. r. *is*. p. 6. l. 5. r. *which when we*. l. 6. r. *place*. l. 7. r. γεγαῶτα Ἀκόλουθον. l. 9. r. *affaires, we have them so*. l. 19. r. *holy man*. p. 7. l. 20. r. *of David*. l. 24. r. *their answer*. p. 8. *marg*. l. 4. r. χειροτονίαν. l. 6. r. ἀναβεβήκασι. p. 10. l. 21. r. *exarchs*. p. 12. l. 1. r. *their not*. p. 13. l. 4 r *to confirme*. l. *penult*. r. *some predecessor*. p. 16. l. 14. r. *of Timothy*. l. 18. r. *a continuall*. p. 18. l. 4. r. *Dorotheus*. p. 22. l. 24. r. *we are*. p. 23. l. 22. r. *mixing*. l. 33. r. *pretensions*. p. 23. l. 35. r. *Chaldee*. p. 24. l. 24. r. *was again*. p. 25. l. 27. r. *And in them of Diotrephes*. p. 31. l. 31. r. *Assemblers*. p. 36. l. 18. r. *for so*. p. 43. l. 11. r. *so this*. p. 49. l. 19. r. *understand* p. 53. l. 25. r. *and so* p. 63. l. 21. r. *most of them lying neer*. p. 66. l. 2. *del.* all, p. 67. l. 1. r. Sect. XVII. p. 69. l. 33. r. *the first Canon, which*. p. 72. l. 7. r. *first in*. p. 73. l. 22. r. ἀναγνώσεως. l. 29. r. χωρεῖ. p. 74. l. 14. r. *head-Lords*. p. 76. l. 5. r. *formally*. p. 78. l. 1. r. *formally*. p. 79. *marg*. l. 10. r. Ἱεροσολύμων. p. 83. l. 33. r. *Metropoles*. p. 85. l. 5. r. *Antoninus Pius*. l. 24. r. *sent so to* p. 89. l. 23. r. בּוֹשׁ ל. l. 32. r. Ἐστεὰν l. 34. r. *so read*. p. 94. *marg*. l. 4. r. ὀνόμαζον. l. 25. r. *affirmt*. p. 97. *marg*. l. 4. r. χωρεῖται. p. 99. l. 18. r. μαζονῶ. l. 25. r. πρεσβύς. p. 100. l. 20. r. τοῦτον. l. 30. r. 3. p. 107. l. 25. r. *A third*. p. 111. l. 6 r τίνων. l. 12. r. ἐκλεῖν. p. 127. l. 16. r. *any sort*. p. 128. l. *penul*. r. *and so*. p. 132. l. 1. r. πρεσβύτερε. l. 4. r. Ρωμὴν. l. 22. r. *Province*. p. 136. l. 22. r. ἡγούμενος. p. 139. l. *ult*. r. ἡμᾶς. p. 140. l. 1. r. προφητικῶ. l. 34. r. ἀποδίδαγμένα. l. 35. r. ὠφελιθῆναι. p. 142. l. 22. r. *of spurious*. p. 249. *marg*. l. 2. r. γνώμας. l. 13. r. ἀκολυθεῖτε p. 155. l. 23. r. *Ecclesia*. l. 29 r. *of the*. p. 160. l. 1. r. *know not that*. p. 162 l. 2. r *servare Catholicæ*. p. 165. l. 25. r. *answer*. l. *by* p. 166. l. 17. r. Ἐπιτροπῶ ἐπισκόπους p. 167. l. 3. r. *that place would purchase justice*. p. 169. l. 22. r. Ἀρχίας. l. 23. r. Ἰωαννὴς. p. 171. l. 8. r. *Synod. ad Quercum*. p. 174. l. 8. r. *yeares since*. p. 183. l. 14. r. *so how far this is*. p. 184. l. 15. r. χειροτὸν. l. 16. r. γνώμην.